

to rate of wages at the Government Printing Office—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Sundry petitions of citizens of the State of Indiana, for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of liquors in canteens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RHEA of Kentucky (by request): Petition of S. H. Perkins and other citizens, of Elkton, Ky., to accompany House bill granting a pension to Charles W. Bivins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to S. H. Duvall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Charles E. Binns, of Langley, Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Petition of John N. Ames and 8 other pharmacists of Chelsea, Mass., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCUDDER: Petition of certain citizens of Hicksville, N. Y., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumery, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of the Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, for the redress of certain grievances—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petition of George S. Howes, of Jackson, Mich., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumery, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPIGHT: Papers relating to the claim of Mrs. M. A. Doak, administratrix of A. M. Doak, of Lafayette County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: Resolutions of Farragut Post, No. 28, Department of New Jersey, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of Building Trades Council and Painters and Decorators of America, against further oleomargarine legislation by Congress—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Jacob Imandt and 8 wage-workers of New York City, against the passage of House bill No. 10275, amending the postal law relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Grain Dealers' National Association of Chicago, Ill., praying for a reduction of the war-revenue tax on grain or cotton tickets and bills of lading—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of John F. Hazlett, E. Bingham, and 22 others, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the passage of House bill No. 10275, amending the postal law relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ZIEGLER: Papers to accompany House bill No. 10689, granting a pension to Michael Falkoner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, May 10, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. PENROSE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

BATTLEFIELD MONUMENTS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War, submitting estimates of appropriations for the superintendent of battlefields, \$1,500, and for repairs of monuments, etc., Antietam battlefield, \$2,000; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

COPYRIGHT LAWS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a compilation embodying the enactments relating to copyright from 1783 to 1899; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL-SERVICE LAW.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Civil Service Commission, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 3d instant, papers in connection with alleged violations of section 11 of the civil-service act, oc-

curing during the year 1899, in Ohio and in Kentucky; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed with amendments the bill (S. 2657) to reimburse sundry collectors of internal revenue for internal-revenue stamps paid for and charged in their accounts and not received by them; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 392) to pay the General Marine Insurance Company of Dresden the sum of \$1,434.12 for certain coupons detached from United States bonds; which said coupons were lost on the Cunard Steamship *Oregon*, sunk at sea March 14, 1886;

A bill (S. 1284) for the relief of W. H. L. Pepperell, of Concordia, Kans.;

A bill (S. 1356) for the relief of Edwin L. Field;

A bill (S. 1394) for the relief of the Union Iron Works, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A bill (S. 1905) granting an increase of pension to Lillian Capron;

A bill (S. 1906) granting an increase of pension to Agnes K. Capron;

A bill (S. 2366) to authorize the establishment at some point in North Carolina of a station for the investigation of problems connected with marine fishery interests of the Middle and South Atlantic coast;

A bill (S. 2499) to authorize needed repairs of the graveled or macadamized road from the city of Newbern, N. C., to the national cemetery near said city;

A bill (S. 2559) authorizing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to redeem or make allowance for internal-revenue stamps;

A bill (S. 3537) to grant authority to change the name of the steamship *Paris*;

A bill (H. R. 1381) granting an increase of pension to James J. Angel;

A bill (H. R. 1737) granting a pension to Cora I. Cromwell;

A bill (H. R. 4030) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Coleman;

A bill (H. R. 4276) granting an increase of pension to John R. Eggeman;

A bill (H. R. 6784) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Neff;

A bill (H. R. 7022) granting a pension to Rhoda A. Patman;

A bill (H. R. 8079) granting a pension to Bertha M. Jordan; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 198) providing for the printing and distribution of the general report of the expedition of the steamer *Fishhawk* to Porto Rico, including the chapter relating to the fish and fisheries of Porto Rico, as contained in the Fish Commission Bulletin for 1900.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented the petition of Martha A. Royce, of Hot Springs, N. C., praying that she be granted indemnity for the use and occupation of her property by soldiers during the late civil war; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MCBRIDE presented a petition of Liberty Grange, No. 292, Patrons of Husbandry, of Liberty, Oreg., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Liberty Grange, No. 292, Patrons of Husbandry, of Liberty, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to secure the advantages of State control of imitation dairy products; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Peterboro, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHOUP presented a petition of sundry citizens of Idaho, praying for the establishment of a fish hatchery at Henrys Lake, Fremont County, Idaho; which was referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also presented a petition of 78 citizens of Bear Lake County, Idaho, and a petition of 615 citizens of Nez Perce County, Idaho, praying for the passage of the so-called free-homestead bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FORAKER presented a petition of the Presbytery of Steubenville, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Army, Soldiers' Homes,

immigrant stations, and any other Government property; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Hull, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DELAWARE RIVER RANGE LIGHTS.

Mr. PENROSE. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4532) for reestablishing the range lights on the Delaware River known as Finns Point range, Reedy Island range, and Port Penn range, to report it without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall reestablish the range lights on the Delaware River known as Finns Point range, Reedy Island range, and Port Penn range, at a cost not exceeding \$90,000.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PENROSE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 417) to provide for adding to and completing specimens and productions, both natural and manufactured, of the United States and of foreign countries, to be exhibited in the Philadelphia museums for the purpose of increasing the trade of the United States, reported it without amendment.

Mr. PETTUS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4085) to correct the military record of C. R. Dickson, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3252) to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at or near Johnson City, Washington County, Tenn., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 287) relieving Oscar D. Hendershott of the charge of desertion, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. TURNER, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4448) to provide an American register for the ships *Star of Italy* and the *Star of Bengal*, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. KENNEY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 993) granting an increase of pension to Edwin S. Anderson, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3342) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Dornon, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 415) granting a pension to John Roop, late engineer, United States Navy; and

A bill (S. 4288) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Brooks.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 21st ultimo proposing to appropriate \$2,500,000 for continuing the improvement of the Mississippi River from Head of the Passes to the mouth of the Ohio River, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1559) for the relief of the estate of Emmet Crawford, deceased, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. KYLE, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 4th instant authorizing the continuance of the Industrial Commission until December 31, 1901, with all the powers and duties imposed upon it by the acts of June 18, 1898, and March 3, 1899, etc., intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported it with an amendment, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was recommended the bill (S. 952) granting a pension to Francis M. Porter, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2824) to pay certain judgments against John C. Bates and Jonathan A. Yeckley, captain and first lieutenant in the United States Army, for acts done by them under orders of

their superior officers, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1010) to pay certain judgments against John C. Bates and Jonathan A. Yeckley, captain and first lieutenant in the United States Army, for acts done by them under orders of their superior officers, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3514) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. C. Kaigler, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4615) to facilitate the entry of steamships engaged in the coasting trade between Porto Rico and the United States, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5552) for the relief of Northrup & Chick, and also of Thomas N. Stinson, reported it without amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1653) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Point Pleasant, W. Va., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TELLER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1618) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and adjudicate the claim of the personal representatives of William Kiskadden, deceased, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Fisheries, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 3d instant proposing to appropriate \$10,000 to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in Idaho, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, submitted a report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 3d instant proposing to appropriate \$4,752 to pay those Indians who served the United States under Gen. O. O. Howard in the late war with Joseph's band of the Nez Percés tribe of Indians, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, submitted a report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3173) to ratify an agreement with the Indians of the Crow Reservation in Montana, and making appropriations to carry the same into effect, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. THURSTON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4718) to regulate the collection and disbursement of moneys arising from leases made by the Seneca Nation of New York Indians, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3415) to regulate the collection and disbursement of moneys arising from leases made by the Seneca Nation of New York Indians, and for other purposes, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7740) to amend section 8 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the Fort Smith and Western Railroad Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw and Creek Nations, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3946) for the relief of George F. Schild, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

CLAIMS OF CITIZENS OF VIRGINIA.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2060) for the relief of certain citizens of Virginia, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 2060) entitled "A bill for the relief of certain citizens of Virginia," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

PAYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the stenographer employed to report the testimony taken by the Committee on Printing in relation to the Messages and Papers of the Presidents be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 4631) for the relief of Martha A. Royce; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 4632) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Thomas Scully; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4633) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George F. Harter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 4634) granting an increase of pension to Georgianna C. Hall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 4635) to provide for the restoration of the rate of wages paid to machinists in the Government Printing Office; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4636) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David A. Nichols; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4637) to correct the military record of Isaac Thompson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LINDSAY introduced a bill (S. 4638) to amend the act of March 3, 1897, entitled "An act to allow the bottling of distilled spirits in bond," and to permit the bottling of reimported American whisky in customs bonded warehouses; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 4639) for the relief of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, at Clifton, Wayne County, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SULLIVAN introduced a bill (S. 4640) for the relief of Mollie T. Benson; which was read twice by its title, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4641) to authorize the construction of telephone lines east of Anacostia River in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a bill (S. 4642) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Gainesville, Fla., and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 4643) to authorize the purchase of the painting of the battle of Lookout Mountain; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 4644) to restore to the public domain a small tract of the White Mountain Apache Indian Reservation, in the Territory of Arizona; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 4645) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Meldrum; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 4646) granting an increase of pension to James H. D. Payne; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4647) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Johnston; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4648) granting an increase of pension to Simeon A. Jackson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4649) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Isaac F. Talbot; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 4650) to amend and reenact an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 4651) for the relief of David Cohen, sr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 4652) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of site and erection of a building thereon at Aberdeen, S. Dak.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HANNA introduced a bill (S. 4653) granting a pension to Henrietta M. Lewis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. MALLORY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$30,000 for completing the improvement of the military roadway from Pensacola, Fla., to the national cemetery near that city, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for a public building at Tampa, Fla., from \$250,000 to \$350,000, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LINDSAY submitted an amendment fixing the salary of the appointment clerk, Census Bureau, at \$2,400 per annum, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Census, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SIMON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$900 for a fish culturist at the Clackamas fish station, Oregon, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOAR submitted an amendment proposing to amend sections 2529 and 2544 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to appraisers of merchandise, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KENNEY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$5,000 to pay the National Investment Company, of Washington City, D. C., for arrearages of rent in connection with the municipal building, No. 464 Louisiana avenue, for the use of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

OAKLAND HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. PERKINS submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to make careful examination and prepare a detailed plan and estimate for the improvement of Oakland Harbor, California, to meet the needs of present and prospective commerce, from the western end of the tidal canal to deep water in San Francisco Bay, including the excavation of a tidal basin, the report to be submitted to Congress at its next session.

PORTSMOUTH HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be directed to cause a survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of removing a portion of Hendersons Point, Portsmouth Harbor, New Hampshire, with a view of improving navigation to the navy-yard.

LIST OF MAPS.

Mr. HOAR. I submit a resolution for which I ask present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Librarian of Congress be, and he is hereby, instructed to send to the Senate a list of the maps relating to America now in the Library of Congress.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I understand that the list is all prepared, requiring no further expense, but the document is merely to be sent in. The resolution was agreed to.

REGULATIONS FOR TRAVEL IN HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

Mr. HOAR. I offer the following resolution, for which I desire present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be directed to inquire whether American citizens are obliged to obtain passports or other license, or to pay any fees for permission to pass from the Hawaiian Islands to any part of the United States, or from any part of the United States to the Hawaiian Islands, or to make any payment or deposit of money to secure the privilege of landing in said islands, and whether it is expedient that such regulations be longer continued.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Yes, Mr. President—

Mr. HOAR. There can be no possible objection to it.

Mr. DAVIS. I should like to hear the resolution read again.

Mr. HOAR. Let the resolution be read again.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If I may be permitted to say one word, I know debate is not in order, but I think when such resolutions are presented to the Senate, if any Senator desires to look at a resolution and to inform himself a little about the subject-matter, it is quite proper that it should go over for one day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution goes over.

Mr. FORAKER. Before we pass from that, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we have a Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and inasmuch as this is a matter relating entirely to one of the Pacific Islands, and should be within the jurisdiction of that committee, as I suppose, I suggest to the Senator the inquiry ought to be directed to that committee. I am not particular about taking this additional labor upon myself. I suppose it was simply overlooked by the Senator.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If that action can be taken, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. HOAR. I will not say that it is not a matter of the slightest possible general importance, but the adoption of the resolution is not very important, because I presume I can get the information in another way, by inquiring of the Secretary of State, or by a private note from the committee.

I will state the reason for offering it. Some complaints have reached me. I have one now on my desk, which I shall not undertake to read and which I did not propose to make public, from a very worthy and excellent Massachusetts soldier, as to the obligation to deposit a sum of money before he could land at the Hawaiian Islands and to get a passport, of which he sent me a photograph, before he could leave for home.

The reason why I directed the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations was because the Senate had committed to that committee the bill in regard to the Hawaiian Islands and members of that committee had visited the islands and had specially investigated the subject. The bill was largely their work, and I thought this piece of information as to whether those laws were in force or were modified, a mere matter of information, would be more easily rendered by that committee, which has just been over the subject, than by the new committee.

I do not think there is any probability that there will be anything but a simple reply that these regulations have now been abolished, which will be a public satisfaction for travelers. I think that is all that will come of it. It is not a resolution which to my mind indicates any necessity for probing into the matter, but if the Senator from Ohio prefers, I will modify the resolution by saying "the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico" in lieu of "the Committee on Foreign Relations."

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I have no special preference about it, and I called the attention that I did to the matter because I thought this was not a very important subject, simply in order that it might be brought to the attention of Senators in introducing similar resolutions that there is such a committee, and we are supposed to have charge of that which pertains to the Pacific Islands.

Mr. HOAR. I reflected on that.

Mr. FORAKER. There have been a number of similar resolutions introduced and I paid no attention to them, but I thought it my duty, in behalf of the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, to direct attention to it. I have no objection to the inquiry going to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HOAR. It seemed to me, if I may repeat, that this was merely an inquiry as to the effect of the bill which had just come from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the chairman of that committee would reply that this state of things had been changed by the new law, and that information would go to the public.

Mr. FORAKER. I am quite willing now, after this explanation has been had, that the inquiry may go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut rose.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will look at it he will see it is a very trifling matter.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will not the Senator be satisfied if the resolution is referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. That will satisfy me. Otherwise I want to look at it.

Mr. HOAR. Very well; if my friend wishes to make a mountain out of a molehill, he can.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not think molehills ought to be introduced into the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, when a mote gets into the eye of an American citizen, it is sometimes quite exasperating, even if it is not of any great size. I should like to repeat that this resolution was offered simply in order to elicit some information which would enable American travelers to know that the requirement to get passports and deposit sums of money in the Hawaiian Islands had now been remedied; that is all. It is the slightest possible affair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations? The Chair hears none, and it is so referred.

LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES IN PORTO RICO.

Mr. FORAKER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That there be printed 1,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 300, of which 300 shall be for the use of the War Department, 100 for the use of the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and 600 for the use of the Senate.

SENATOR FROM MONTANA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the following resolution:

The Secretary read the resolution reported by Mr. CHANDLER from the Committee on Privileges and Elections April 23, 1900, as follows:

Resolved, That WILLIAM A. CLARK was not duly and legally elected to a seat in the Senate of the United States by the legislature of the State of Montana.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the resolution be postponed until Tuesday next, at 1 o'clock. If this motion prevails, I shall ask for the resolution continuous consideration, to the exclusion of all other business; except such as may be done by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire moves that the resolution be postponed until Tuesday next, at 1 o'clock.

Mr. SULLIVAN. By its postponement I suppose it does not necessarily follow that we thereby consent that next Tuesday it shall be taken up and be continuously considered until it is disposed of. As far as I am concerned—

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator understands very well that the resolution is subject to the orders of the Senate. The motion is now to postpone it until 1 o'clock on Tuesday next.

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is the entire motion, I understand.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then I gave notice that I should ask the Senate at that time to continue its consideration to the exclusion of all other business except such as may be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is a matter to be considered then.

Mr. SEWELL. Does the Senator propose to have the resolution exclude appropriation bills and conference reports?

Mr. CHANDLER. Everything.

Mr. SEWELL. I shall object to that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire moves that the further consideration of the resolution be postponed until 1 o'clock on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is one other resolution to be laid before the Senate.

Mr. BACON. I should like to inquire whether the postponement of the resolution until a specified hour without reference to the morning business does not make it thereafter the unfinished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no such thing as unfinished business in the morning hour.

Mr. BACON. The Chair will recall that I based the inquiry upon the fact that the motion did not have reference to the morning hour. There was no specification of the morning hour in the motion. The morning business may be finished before that time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning hour extends from 12 o'clock till 2.

Mr. BACON. I understand, then, that the motion relates to the morning hour and does not relate to the routine business of the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

POLICY OF PROTECTION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the following resolution; which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. GALLINGER on the 7th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the existing phenomenal business prosperity of the country is largely due to the policy of protection, furnishing conclusive proof of the wisdom and patriotism of the Republican party in the enactment of the Dingley tariff law.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to submit a substitute for that resolution and to withdraw the one I formerly offered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire submits a resolution which, without objection, will be received as a substitute for the resolution just read. The Secretary will read the substitute.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the existing phenomenal prosperity of the country is largely due to the policy of protection as embodied in the provisions of the Dingley tariff law.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] desires to make a request of me, which I will accede to, with the understanding that I will not yield to any further requests of a similar kind.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT NEW ORLEANS.

Mr. MONEY. I ask consent to bring up for consideration the bill (S. 597) to provide for a public building at New Orleans, La. It has been favorably reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HALE. Not to interfere with the Senator from Mississippi, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me for a statement?

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall be pleased to do so, Mr. President.

Mr. MONEY. It will take only a moment to pass this bill.

Mr. HALE. I wish only to make an announcement, not to interfere with the Senator from Mississippi.

I had hoped that we might take up and finish the naval appropriation bill to-day, but I find on examination that it is a broken day. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has given notice that he desires to speak at the present time, and at 3 o'clock the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY] desires to ask the Senate to consider resolutions upon a deceased colleague in the other House. After the eulogies, of course, nothing under the rules and practice of the Senate can be done. I therefore give notice that to-morrow morning, directly after the routine morning business, when I hope we may have an unbroken day, I shall call up the naval appropriation bill with the expectation of finishing it to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi asks for the present consideration of a bill which will be read in full to the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 597) to provide for a public building at New Orleans, La.; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site, and cause to be erected thereon a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office and other governmental offices in the city of New Orleans and State of Louisiana, the cost of said site and building, including said vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, not to exceed the sum of \$1,250,000.

Proposals for the sale of land suitable for said site shall be invited by public advertisement in one or more of the newspapers of said city of largest circulation for at least twenty days prior to the date specified in said advertisement for the opening of said proposals.

Proposals made in response to said advertisement shall be addressed and mailed to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall then cause the said proposed sites, and such others as he may think proper to designate, to be examined in person by an agent of the Treasury Department, who shall make written report to said Secretary of the results of said examination and of his recommendation thereon, and the reasons therefor, which shall be accompanied by the original proposals and all maps, plats, and statements which shall have come into his possession relating to the said proposed sites.

If, upon consideration of said report and accompanying papers, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem further investigation necessary, he may appoint a commission of not more than three persons, one of whom shall be an officer of the Treasury Department, which commission shall also examine the said proposed sites, and such others as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate, and grant such hearings in relation thereto as they shall deem necessary; and said commission shall within thirty days after such examination make to the Secretary of the Treasury written report of their conclusion in the premises, accompanied by all statements, maps, plats, or documents taken by or submitted to them, in like manner as hereinbefore provided in regard to the proceedings of said agent of the Treasury Department; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon finally determine the location of the building to be erected.

The compensation of said commissioners shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, but the same shall not exceed \$3 per day and actual traveling expenses: *Provided, however,* That the member of said commission appointed from the Treasury Department shall be paid only his actual traveling expenses.

The building shall be unexposed to danger from fire by an open space of at least 40 feet on each side, including streets and alleys.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POLICY OF PROTECTION.

The Senate proceeded to consider the following resolution, submitted this day by Mr. GALLINGER:

Resolved, That the existing phenomenal prosperity of the country is largely due to the policy of protection as embodied in the provisions of the Dingley tariff law.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as I propose to speak on a question this morning that in certain quarters and probably by certain Senators is considered not an issue before the American people at the present time, I do not flatter myself that I shall secure the attention of any very considerable number of this body, but I trust that at least ordinary order may be maintained.

Mr. President, in May, 1894, I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that throughout our entire history low tariffs had resulted in disaster to the American people, while high tariffs had invariably restored confidence, stimulated business, and brought prosperity and happiness to all classes of our citizens. Again, two years later, when the Wilson tariff law was in full sway, and the country was going through a period of business depression and industrial ruin, I endeavored to point out the way

of relief through the repeal of that statute and the enactment of a law that would exact of foreign manufacturers and importers a rate of duty that would at least equalize the difference in wages as between the United States and foreign countries. The Dingley tariff law has accomplished the desired result, and I now propose to show that the election of Grover Cleveland as President in November, 1892, and the enactment of the Wilson-Gorman tariff law in August, 1894, resulted in national adversity, while the election of William McKinley as President in November, 1896, and the enactment of the Dingley tariff law in July, 1897, has resulted in national prosperity.

Before portraying the overwhelming misery into which this nation was plunged by the election of a low-tariff administration in November, 1892, I shall point out the harmlessness of that law as finally passed in comparison with what was originally intended. Having done this I shall demonstrate, by facts and figures, the marvellous transformation from the gloomy era of low-tariff legislation to the sunshine of protection as embodied in the Dingley tariff law.

Concerning the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill, Edwin A. Hartshorn, in the American Economist of January 5, 1894, said:

If the tariff reformers had coveted for themselves political annihilation and asked their opponents to become their executioners, a tariff bill more destructive could not have been formulated for the purpose. It has obliterated political lines as completely as did the bombardment of Fort Sumter in 1861, and its defeat or material modification is a certainty.

The extreme free-traders having failed in the House of Representatives to secure reductions satisfactory to themselves, a subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee, consisting of Senators JONES of Arkansas, VEST of Missouri, and MILLS of Texas, assumed control of the bill when it came to the Senate and proceeded to cut down many of the rates of duty below that fixed by the House.

To such an extent did their work proceed that several Democratic Senators, whose love of country outweighed their love of party, determined upon a line of action which would either stop the slaughter of American industries or defeat the bill on its final passage.

The names and the exact number of these Senators may never be made a matter of public record, but they were strong enough numerically and possessed of sufficient courage to rescue the nation to a considerable extent from the impending calamity, and many rates adopted by the House of Representatives were increased before the bill was reported to the Senate.

The work of these patriotic Senators extended so far in rescuing the industries of the country from annihilation, that President Cleveland, repudiating the bill, permitted it to become a law without his signature, and thus the prophecy of Mr. Hartshorn was fulfilled, and the hatching capacity of the bill, which he called "a soup-house incubator," was largely reduced by the changes made in the Senate.

It is not difficult, therefore, to understand why the anticipation of free trade caused greater disaster than the enactment itself, because the full force of the intended scourge never reached us, and that disaster came upon the country almost immediately after the victory at the polls of the so-called tariff reformers in 1892 is easy of demonstration.

DISASTERS TO BANKING INSTITUTIONS.

The great financial institutions of the country were the first to suffer. Every savings bank in the United States practically suspended payment before the manufacturers were seriously crippled. The truthfulness of this statement may be questioned, but the fact that the savings banks posted sixty days' notices and refused to pay depositors on demand beyond a mere pittance of about \$10 at a time, and that depositors who wished to withdraw even that small amount were compelled to stand in line in many instances for hours and sometimes for days attests the fact that the savings banks did practically suspend payment.

The American Economist of February 16, 1894, said:

The savings banks of New York State give a remarkable record of the effect of the year of free trade. During 1893 the amount of money withdrawn was \$34,518,091 in excess of the amount deposited. As compared with the prosperous year of 1892, the deposits of 1893 were twenty-four millions less and the withdrawals were twenty-seven millions larger, thus showing the aggregate loss during the two years of \$51,000,000. This whole loss fell upon the wage-earners, who usually put their savings away on deposit, but who, under the free-trade Administration, lost \$51,000,000 in 1893 as compared with 1892.

A statement of the number of banks that failed in the United States between May 1 and July 23, 1893, was made by the Manufacturers' Record. The list was given in detail and by States, and aggregated a total of 301 failed and suspended banking institutions, with a capital of \$38,951,033. This made an average of 3.6 banking concerns tied up on every one of the eighty-three days.

The Vermont Standard of March 1, 1894, said:

The lesson of 1893 closes with this handwriting on the blackboard:
May 4, 1893, to October 3, 1893, withdrawn by the people from national banks, \$378,000,000.
Loans called in by national banks, \$318,000,000.
National banks and other banking institutions suspended payment in 1893, 585.
Railroad property gone into the hands of receivers, over \$1,200,000,000.
The money lost to thousands of men and women representing every form

and grade of labor, estimated by Mr. David Wells to be more than a thousand million dollars, or more than one-third of the amount of the national debt at the close of the war.

At no time in the history of the United States have so many people been out of work.

Cause: Distrust.
Distrust of banks? No.
Distrust of currency? No.
Distrust widespread, public distrust—in the legislative branch of the Government, with its Democratic majority and possibilities.

J. Edward Simmons, president of the Fourth National Bank of the city of New York, who, in the New York Sun of November 11, 1893, said, "The election of Grover Cleveland can only be regarded by all conservative business men as a fortunate thing for this country," also said in the New York Herald of May 20, 1896, "Panic! We have been so deep in a hole for three years that things can not get any lower."

The Springfield (Mass.) Morning Union of February 8, 1896, said:

During 1892 the earnings of all the national banks in the United States were \$66,500,000; in 1894 they were less than \$42,000,000; in 1895 there was an increase of 25 per cent in the number of bank failures and suspensions as compared with 1894, mostly in the State and private banks. The savings banks tell the story of hard times and privations. A falling off of 50,000 depositors and of \$37,000,000 in the amount of money deposited and of more than a dollar in the average per capita of savings for the whole people of the United States all point a moral and teach the story of living from hand to mouth, with a struggle to make both ends meet, without being able to put away a dollar for old age.

Bradstreet's of April 4, 1896, gives the business failures of the first three months of 1893 to 1896 as follows:

Year.	Number of failures.	Total liabilities.
1892.....	3,207	\$35,861,749
1893.....	3,069	39,424,144
1894.....	3,969	49,085,088
1895.....	3,812	46,910,443
1896.....	4,512	62,513,826

I could stand here, Mr. President, and give extracts from authentic publications and the utterances of reputable men and newspapers almost without limit, but I proceed in that direction only far enough to establish the fact that the financial institutions of the country were not prosperous during the approach of the last low-tariff era, and that the manufacturers and artisans of the country did not relish the prospect of practical free trade.

The New York Herald of August 15, 1893, had the following headlines, that conveyed an idea of the situation at that time:

Fifty thousand out of work in Chicago and thousands more will be laid off.
Cincinnati workers in the building trades have 5,000 men out of work.
More than half the wage-earners in and around Pittsburgh have been laid off.
Five thousand men out of work in San Francisco, and much distress prevails.

Ten thousand men idle in Buffalo owing to the financial stringency.
All trades in Philadelphia affected, and many are laid off.

LABOR INTERESTS PROSTRATED.

An industrial census was taken by the American Protective Tariff League in September, 1893. This investigation covered the entire country, and the total number of reports obtained was 684, coming from 44 different States. The complete results of this census were given in the American Economist of October 20, 1893. It showed a decrease in labor since November 5, 1892, of 61½ per cent, a decrease in wages during the same time of 69 per cent, and a decrease in business of 47.2 per cent. It showed that in the 684 establishments reporting, as compared with November 5, 1892, there were 101,763 hands out of work, and a loss in total weekly wages of \$1,202,851.36, with an average decrease in the rate of wages per week of \$2.35.

A STRIKING COMPARISON.

The Cleveland World of October 1, 1895, said:

We present below a table showing the imports of important articles during the ten months of 1893-94 under the Republican tariff as compared with the imports of the same articles in 1894-95 under the Wilson tariff:

Articles.	1893-94.	1894-95.	Per cent of increase.
Woolens.....	\$7,884,711	\$29,082,510	269
Wool.....	4,801,441	25,970,907	441
Cotton goods.....	17,299,360	29,188,134	69
Silk goods.....	17,981,624	26,645,320	48
Other textiles.....	14,421,444	21,083,154	52
Iron products.....	6,898,373	9,523,396	38
Earthenware.....	4,869,680	7,583,563	56
Leather manufactures.....	3,516,761	5,857,028	67
Glassware.....	3,797,960	5,335,112	40
Art products.....	1,428,231	3,618,724	153
Animals, dutiable.....	1,190,753	1,946,026	63
Hay.....	687,810	970,273	85
Buttons.....	278,098	1,274,689	249
Eggs.....	149,594	312,890	109
Total.....	85,205,780	139,296,731	*98

* Average.

In reference to the above table, it should be borne in mind that the showing for woolens is only for six months during the two periods contrasted, because the new woolen schedule did not go into full force until January 1, 1895.

Mr. President, this table shows that the imports into the United States from other countries in the line of goods mentioned were practically doubled during the year 1894-95, and it requires no great gift of logic to conclude that these products supplanted products of American labor. As a matter of course, if the goods were made elsewhere, they could have been made in the United States.

RAILROADS INJURED.

What the effect of the threat of free trade was upon the railroads of this country may be learned from the following extract from the interstate-commerce report of 1895:

This office has never before been called upon to report a decrease in the number of railroad employees, but it appears from the above figures that on June 30, 1894, there were in the employ of railways 779,608 persons, as against 873,603 persons in 1893. This shows a decrease of 93,994.

LABOR UNEMPLOYED AND WAGES REDUCED.

In order to ascertain the condition of labor in New York State, in the spring of 1894 the American Protective Tariff League again took an industrial census. They asked manufacturers to state the average number of hands employed during 1892-93 and up to the date of reporting in 1894. The returns given by 100 manufacturers and employers in the State of New York show that where 22,026 people were busy and earning steady wages in 1892, there were only 17,480 people employed during 1893, a decrease of 21 per cent. The reports indicated that steady work was then being given only to 12,650 persons where 22,026 were at work in 1892, a decrease of 42½ per cent.

The complete exhibit showed that where 169,423 hands were employed during the week ending November 5, 1892, there were but 67,600 hands employed in the same business during the week ending September 2, 1893, or that 101,763 people, representing 60½ per cent of those employed during the previous year, were out of work.

The tables showed that where \$1,762,388 were paid out in wages during the week ending November 5, 1892, there were but \$549,437 paid out during the week ending September 2, 1893, a loss of 69 per cent in the disbursement and circulation of money as compared with the same time the previous year.

Besides a loss of \$1,202,851 every week in disbursements for wages, there was a decrease of 47.2 per cent in the volume of business transacted, and the average amount of wages earned by each person working during the week ending November 5, 1892, was \$10.43, while the average wage rate during the corresponding period in 1893 was but \$8.03 for each person working, thus making a decrease of \$2.35 in the average weekly earnings of each person.

A PROTEST FROM LABOR.

On the evening of January 12, 1894, there was a mass meeting of wage-earners held at Cooper Union in the city of New York. At this meeting the following resolutions were adopted by rising vote:

Whereas a large percentage of the working people in the various industries of this country are to-day out of employment; and

Whereas this is the direct result of the proposed passage of what is known as the Wilson tariff bill, which is simply free trade for the country; and

Whereas the platform of the Democratic party declared for a tariff for revenue only, and asserted by its supporters that such a tariff would increase the wages of labor and reduce the cost of the necessities of life; and

Whereas the recommendations of the Wilson bill have had an entirely opposite effect by destroying public confidence and closing mills and factories, resulting in an amount of enforced idleness and want unparalleled in the history of this country, as opposed to the former conditions of prosperity, high wages, and employment: Be it

Resolved, That we wage-earners, irrespective of party affiliation, in mass meeting assembled, representing 500,000 operatives in every branch of industry, do earnestly protest against the passage of the so-called Wilson bill, or of any measure of its character, or of any legislation which shall dwarf the established industries of this country.

AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS.

The losses to the agricultural interests of the United States growing out of the free-trade tariff experiment of 1894-1897 were tremendous and mounted up into billions. Let us undertake the vast computation by starting with 1892, a year of hitherto unequaled prosperity, brought about in a great measure by the splendid workings of the McKinley tariff of 1890. As a basis of reckoning we will take the total home consumption of wheat and corn for the five years commencing with 1892 and ending with 1896. From the official reports of the United States we glean the following facts:

Wheat consumption.

Year.	Population.	Total bushels.	Per capita.	Decrease from 1892.
1892.....	65,403,000	368,531,730	5.91	
1893.....	66,826,000	344,106,100	4.85	42,425,630
1894.....	68,275,000	232,177,500	2.41	153,713,423
1895.....	69,753,000	316,678,620	4.54	69,853,110
1896.....	71,263,000	340,637,140	4.78	45,894,590
Total decreased consumption of wheat in the United States during four years.....				311,886,196

Corn consumption.

Year.	Popula- tion.	Total bushels.	Per capita.	Decrease from 1892.
1892	65,403,000	2,082,672,990	30.33	
1893	66,826,000	1,581,103,160	23.66	502,669,830
1894	68,275,000	1,553,939,000	22.70	529,733,990
1895	69,753,000	1,204,405,940	16.98	879,267,050
1896	71,263,000	1,033,959,000	14.73	1,033,959,000
Total decreased consump- tion of corn in the United States during four years				2,945,629,870
Add decrease in wheat, as above				311,886,196
Total decrease, four years				3,257,516,066

Note the enormous decrease of more than three and a quarter billions bushel of wheat and corn in the consumption of food-stuffs during the four years of Cleveland and tariff reform. The less a man earns the less he eats—not from choice, but from necessity. The per capita consumption of wheat fell off from 5.91 bushels in 1892, a McKinley tariff year, to 2.41 bushels in 1894, the first year of the Wilson tariff, and the total consumption of wheat in those memorable "lean years" fell off 311,886,196 bushels. As to corn the result was still more startling. From a per capita consumption of 30.33 bushels in 1892, the average fell to 14.73 bushels in 1896.

Mark you, these figures are from the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1896, prepared under the direction of and submitted to Congress by Hon. John G. Carlisle, President Cleveland's free-trade Secretary of the Treasury.

Now let us find the total production of wheat and corn in the United States each year for five years, the total value of each year's crop compared with 1892, when the wheat crop of the United States was larger than in any of the other years named, and the world's wheat crop was as large as the average of the years since 1892. The following figures are taken from page 293 of the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1896, prepared under the direction of Secretary Carlisle, as shown by his letter submitting the same to the House of Representatives, and from page 559 of the Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture, prepared by Secretary J. Sterling Morton, one of the most extreme free traders in the nation:

Farm loss on wheat crops.

Year.	Total bush- els.	Total value.	Decrease from 1892.
1892	515,949,000	\$322,111,881	
1893	396,131,725	213,171,381	\$108,940,500
1894	460,267,416	225,902,025	96,209,856
1895	467,102,947	237,938,968	84,172,883
1896	427,684,316	310,602,559	11,500,342
Total decrease in value of United States wheat crops during four years			300,832,581

Farm loss on corn crops.

Year.	Total bush- els.	Total value.	Decrease from 1892.
1892	1,628,464,000	\$642,146,630	
1893	1,619,496,131	591,625,627	\$50,521,003
1894	1,212,770,052	554,719,162	87,427,468
1895	2,151,138,580	567,509,106	74,637,524
1896	2,283,875,165	491,006,967	151,139,663
Total decrease in value of United States corn crops dur- ing four years			363,725,658
Add total farm loss on wheat during the four years			300,832,581
Total loss on wheat and corn			664,558,239

It will be noticed that the loss in the value of the wheat crops in the United States during 1893, 1894, 1895, and 1896 was \$300,832,581, or nearly one-third of the total value of the crops for the four years, when compared with the value of the wheat crops in 1892. It will also be noticed that the total decreased farm value of the corn crops of the four years aggregated \$363,725,658, making a total loss of \$664,558,239 on the farm values of the wheat and corn crops of the United States during these four years of low tariff as compared with the farm value of those crops in 1892. Remember that it is the "farm" value of the grains that is quoted from the official tables.

If figured on the export value of wheat and corn for the years named the loss would be nearly double that of the "farm" loss, or more than a billion dollars. These are vitally important facts to the farmers of the nation, and they are only another link in the chain of official proofs—prepared by free-trade officials—that the farmers of the United States lost over \$5,000,000,000 by the decreased consumption and decreased values of wheat and corn crops during the four years of low tariff and silver agitation.

But this is not all. The losses on the values of farm animals during the four years ending March 4, 1897, were enormous. The

following figures are taken from pages 574, 575, 576, and 577 of the Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture, 1897, prepared under the direction of Secretary J. Sterling Morton, the free-trade Secretary of Agriculture during President Cleveland's last term:

Loss on farm animals.

Year.	Total value.	Decrease from 1893.
January 1, 1893	\$2,483,506,681	
January 1, 1894	2,170,916,754	\$312,589,927
January 1, 1895	1,819,446,306	664,060,375
January 1, 1896	1,727,926,084	755,580,597
January 1, 1897	1,655,414,612	828,092,069
Total loss on farm animals during the four low-tariff years		2,500,322,908

It will be noticed that the total loss on the value of the farm animals of the United States during the years 1893, 1894, 1895, and 1896 reached the enormous aggregate of \$2,560,322,968.

Computing again from the official figures put forth by a free-trade Treasury Department, it is found that in the four years—1893-1897—there were the following additional losses to the American farmers in the values of their products:

Loss on barley crops	\$7,250,377
Loss on potato crops	83,291,365
Loss on cotton crops	221,363,355
Loss on wool crops	111,272,023
Loss on tobacco crops	29,873,517

It is worthy of remark in this connection that the prices of wool varied, as follows:

	Cents per pound.
In 1892, McKinley tariff	31½
In 1893, anticipative of free trade in wool	27½
In 1894, Wilson tariff, with wool on the free list	20½
In 1895, after a full year of free trade in wool	18½
In 1896, after two years of stagnation in wool manufacture under free trade in wool and partial free trade in woolsens	18½
Or about 41 per cent loss from McKinley tariff prices.	

The Des Moines (Iowa) Register, a newspaper of high standing, published in the heart of a great agricultural community, thus sums up the terrible record of agricultural losses during the four years of low-tariff devastation and ruin:

Four years' loss on farm crops.

Loss on farm animals	\$2,560,322,968
Loss on wheat crops	300,832,581
Loss on corn crops	363,725,658
Loss on oat crops	138,481,331
Loss on hay crops, three years	461,739,066
Loss on potato crops, three years	83,291,365
Loss on barley crops, three years	7,250,377
Loss on cotton crops	221,363,355
Loss on wool crops	111,272,023
Loss on tobacco crops, three years	29,873,517
Loss on rye crops, two years	1,864,142
Loss on buckwheat crops, two years	172,137
Total loss on four years' crops	4,283,787,520

The Register further says:

It will be noticed that the losses on hay, potato, barley, and tobacco crops are only for three years—1894, 1895, and 1896—the official report stating in each instance that no statistics were gathered in 1892; therefore we were compelled to make the comparison with 1893. The total loss on the hay, potato, barley, and tobacco crops aggregated \$585,154,325, and taking one-third for the decrease in 1893 from 1892 would add \$195,051,441 to the aggregate losses on farm crops. Besides, we have been unable to obtain details of the losses on skins and hides, hemp, flax, jute, vegetables—among which the value of beans and peas exported decreased \$1,563,468—broom corn, fruits, hops, rice, tallow, butter—on which the value of exports decreased \$2,923,588—lard, poultry, eggs, and cheese—on which the value of the exports decreased \$6,002,993. It is probable that if we were able to obtain the full official figures showing the loss on every farm product, the aggregate loss during the four years would exceed over \$5,000,000,000, as still further indicated by the following official statistics, giving the annual loss in the value of the exports of farm products during the four years, taken from page 596 of the Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture, 1896:

Loss on farm products—Exports.

Year.	Total ex- ports.	Decrease from 1892.
1892	\$799,328,232	
1893	615,382,980	\$183,945,246
1894	628,363,038	170,965,194
1895	553,210,026	246,118,206
1896	571,899,845	228,428,387
Total loss on four years' exports		829,457,033

It is important to keep in mind the fact that the population of the world was larger every year during the succeeding four years than it was in 1892, and that in the absence of special causes consumption should have steadily increased instead of decreasing.

The Register concludes its able review of the subject of the damages wrought upon our agricultural interests as follows:

These facts and the official statistics supply the positive proof that the enormous losses of the farmers of the United States were a direct result of the decreased home consumption of their farm products in consequence of millions of laboring men being thrown out of employment by the free-trade Government.

Farmers of the United States lost considerably more than a billion dollars per year by the decreased consumption and decreased values of their products during this period of Democratic tariff—a loss more than twice the amount of the national debt at the close of the war of the rebellion.

But this was not probably more than one-half the losses to the farmers of the United States. There still remains the loss in farm values.

The American Agriculturist of recent date estimates at \$17,550,000 the total amount invested in agriculture at the beginning of the current year. If we take as a basis the very moderate estimate of 25 per cent as representing the depreciation in values of farm real estate during the four years of Cleveland and tariff reform, we find an additional loss to the farmers of the United States of more than \$4,000,000,000.

Taking the loss on the leading agricultural staples and farm animals, amounting to upwards of \$5,000,000,000, and the loss on farm real estate, upwards of \$4,000,000,000, and the loss on the values of minor farm products, such as butter, eggs, poultry, vegetables, etc., which in four years would reach close to a billion dollars, and we have, as the sum total of farmers' losses from 1893 to 1897, growing chiefly out of low-tariff domination, at least \$10,000,000,000.

The American Economist of December 20, 1895, gives the following figures as to the number and value of horses in 1892 and 1895:

	1892.	1895.
Number.....	15,498,140	15,893,318
Total value.....	\$1,007,593,636	\$576,730,580
Value per head.....	\$65.01	\$36.29

From 1892 to 1895 the value of horses decreased by \$430,863,056; the loss per animal being \$28.72.

The Fergus County Argus, published at Lewiston, Mont., September 13, 1894, said:

Henry Wareham last week purchased 3,600 lambs for \$1 per head. Two years ago Mr. Wareham sold the same class of lambs for \$2.25 per head. This will give some idea of how the woolgrowing interest has suffered under the present Administration.

The American Economist of January 17, 1896, said:

The pound of wool exchanged for 7 pounds of granulated sugar indicates good times for the farmers. This was possible on January 1, 1892. But when a pound of wool is worth only 3 pounds of sugar, as was the case on the last day of January this year, it is very clear that the policy of free trade in wool is unprofitable to the American woolgrower. On January 1, 1892, the market price of wheat was \$1.05 per bushel. Granulated sugar was then worth 4 cents per pound. A bushel of wheat bought nearly 26½ pounds of sugar. On January 1, 1896, wheat was worth 69 cents and sugar 5 cents, a bushel of wheat buying less than 14 pounds of sugar.

Bradstreet's of April 11, 1896, gave the then current prices of similar products, as compared with four years ago, as follows:

	Apr. 1, 1896.	Apr. 1, 1892.
AT CHICAGO.		
Steers, per 100 pounds.....	\$3.80	\$4.95
Sheep, per 100 pounds.....	3.50	6.25
Hogs, per 100 pounds.....	3.75	4.90
Horses, each.....	60.00	162.00
Hogs, per pound.....	.04½	.06½
Mutton, per pound.....	.06½	.09½
AT NEW YORK.		
Pork, per barrel.....	8.75	11.25
Lard, per pound.....	.05½	.06½
Butter, per pound.....	.19	.29
Cheese, per pound.....	.10	.12½
Beans, per bushel.....	1.20	2.00
Potatoes, per bushel.....	.50	1.25
Onions, per barrel.....	1.00	2.00
AT BOSTON.		
Wool, per pound.....	.18	.27
Hops, per pound.....	.07	.25

AN INTERESTING RÉSUMÉ.

A recent issue of the New York Sun contained the following interesting résumé of the wonderful increase in the agricultural wealth of the United States. It is a most gratifying exhibit of the development and progress of the leading industry of our country under the policy of protection:

Attention has been so strongly directed during the past two years to the almost sensational enlargement of the foreign market for American manufactured goods and cereals and the enormous development of the manufacturing interests of the country to supply the foreign as well as the home demand that comparatively little notice has been taken of the vast increase in the agricultural wealth of the country, always the largest item in the material prosperity of any country.

The recent report of the Statistician of the Department of Agriculture showed a yield from the harvests of 1899 of 2,073,143,933 bushels of corn, valued at \$29,210,110; 547,363,846 bushels of wheat, of the value of \$319,545,259; 796,177,713 bushels of oats, valued at \$193,167,975; 23,961,741 bushels of rye, valued at \$12,214,118, and 11,094,473 bushels of buckwheat, valued at \$6,183,675. If to this total there be added the value of this season's yield of cotton, there will be found an aggregate value of nearly one and one-half billions of

dollars (\$1,497,821,137) for these agricultural products in 1899, exclusive of tobacco, hay, potatoes, rice, beet root, and sugar cane, which would bring the valuation to \$2,000,000,000, on an agricultural capital in the United States which represents a value of \$17,550,000,000, a gain of nearly \$1,600,000,000 over the figures of the Federal census taken in 1890.

The lowest price for corn in any State or Territory last year was 20 cents a bushel, in Oklahoma; the highest price was 60 cents, in Oregon, which produced less than 300,000 bushels. The smallest yield was in Montana and the largest in Illinois. The six great corn States—Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, and Indiana—produced 1,253,000,000 bushels, more than half of the quantity grown in the whole country. The yield of wheat last year was the largest in ten years, with the exception of 1891. The smallest yield in any State reported was 8,789 bushels, in New Hampshire, and the largest in Minnesota.

Last year's yield of oats has been exceeded only once in ten years. The smallest production in 1899 was 95,000 bushels, in Rhode Island, and the largest was in Illinois. The highest valuation was 68 cents a bushel, in Arizona, and the lowest 19 cents, in Iowa. Only nine States produced more than 1,000,000 bushels each of rye, and these nine yielded 18,000,000 of the 24,000,000 bushels reported by all the States. The highest average price was in Georgia, \$1.12 a bushel, and the lowest price 37 cents, in North Dakota.

It is not only in such standard crops as these that the increase of the agricultural interests of the United States has been large. Hay, one of the most important of the crops of the country, in the extent of which the United States have only one rival, Russia, shows a considerable increase compared with some preceding years, as does tobacco. Cotton has had a decided boom. Its price is now about 50 per cent higher than a few months ago. * * *

There has been a decided advance, averaging, it is computed, 40 per cent in four years, an average gain of 10 per cent a year in live stock. Sheep are higher than for twenty years and are worth, stock raisers declare, about double on the farm what they were five years ago. Cows are worth 50 per cent more than during the ten years preceding 1897. Hogs have advanced heavily. They are not in greater number than in 1892, when they numbered 52,000,000. Their number is estimated now at 50,000,000, but meanwhile the population has increased, and there has been a very largely increased export trade. The present value of the hogs of the country is \$246,000,000, an increase of 25 per cent compared with the valuation of five years ago, but of only 10 per cent in the number, compared with 1896.

During the past five years there has also been an increase of 35 per cent in the value of horses and 20 per cent in the value of mules, and the dairy interest, both for local supply and for foreign export, has increased largely. Poultry sales in the United States, including eggs, will amount in 1900 to fully \$300,000,000; and the produce from live stock, including milk, butter, cheese, hogs and pork products, beef, cattle, mutton, sheep and lambs, hides, and pelts, amounts at the beginning of 1900 to \$515,000,000 for horses, \$110,000,000 for sheep, \$500,000,000 for milk cows, and \$850,000,000 for other cattle. The value of live stock on farms in January was \$2,558,000,000, an increase of \$698,000,000 over 1895.

Implements and machinery show a gain in price within the past five years, and there has been a considerable increase alike in the product and the price of petroleum oil, one of the chief items of shipment from the United States to foreign countries. During the twelve months ending January 1, 1900, the shipments of American petroleum amounted to 122,000,000 gallons, exclusive of 2,000,000 gallons of animal oil, the value of this item of foreign trade being \$80,000,000.

The relation which the agricultural interests of the country—the United States now stands first among the nations of the world in respect to agriculture, Russia, Germany, France, Austria, Great Britain following in the order named—bears to the material development of other branches of business is sometimes imperfectly understood. Farmers are not always liberal, but are always extensive consumers of all manufactured goods, machinery for farming uses, fabrics for clothing, building materials, and farm supplies. Where harvests are liberal and selling prices of live stock and cereals are high, as is now the case, farmers are extensive purchasers of manufactured articles, and they are a very important factor in the development of the country's prosperity in other ways as well.

Farmers are extensive patrons of railroads, and the earnings of these, which, when large, reflect the general prosperity, have the double advantage of increasing the interest on investments and at the same time of enhancing the pay of labor, a very important item in the business of the country, for the railroads of the country, with steamboat and stage connection, give employment to more than a million men, or one in seventy-five of the whole population of the country, and when the railroad business is large and the pay of railroad employees is high there is a corresponding increase in the compensation of those in other lines of work, such as shippers, mechanics, laborers, longshoremen, clerks, and engineers.

Everything may be said to combine—profitable harvests at home and an enlarged market abroad—for the benefit of the American farmer at present, and it need be no cause for surprise that the liquidation of farm mortgages should have been so large and so general during the past two years.

EFFECT ON THE PUBLIC TREASURY.

The United States Treasury did not escape the evil consequences of the low-tariff era. The Washington (D. C.) Post of September 28, 1895, said:

Whatever else the low tariff of 1894 may have accomplished or failed to accomplish, it has unquestionably impoverished the Treasury. Whether the country can prosper while the Treasury is in difficulties is a question. We think not—certainly not while the Government does a banking business, and the Government balance states the keynote of public confidence. * * *

Low tariff has done and left undone many things. Free wool has paralyzed the domestic industry without cheapening wool products for the people. * * * There need be and can be no controversy as to the effects of this great flood of foreign importations upon the Treasury. No one can deny that it has put us in the position of buying more than we can sell and of turning the balance of trade against us to the constantly increasing peril of our gold reserve. Already we have had to buy \$112,000,000 of gold to keep this reserve intact and defer disastrous panic and paralysis in private business.

INCREASE OF NATIONAL DEBT.

The Manufacturer, a Philadelphia publication, in the month of January, 1896, called attention to the increase of the national debt in these words:

Between March 1, 1869, and March 1, 1893, the debt payments of the Republican party amounted to \$1,881,367,873. Between March 1, 1895, and March 1, 1898 (under the rule of Mr. Cleveland), the national debt increased to the extent of \$262,602,245; that is to say, since Mr. Cleveland returned to office he has put back upon the people just about one-seventh of the debt that his Republican predecessors took off. Give him a little more time and no doubt he would restore the whole of it.

The American Economist presented the facts in another interesting form, as follows:

Republican monthly decrease of debt, 1865 to 1893, \$5,701,114.77.

Democratic monthly increase of debt, 1893 to 1896, \$7,502,921.28.

The Rochester (N. Y.) Post-Express in April, 1896, said:

The Harrison Administration borrowed as follows:

1890	Nothing
1891	Nothing
1892	Nothing
1893	Nothing

Total Nothing

Up to date the Cleveland Administration has borrowed as follows:

1894 (February)	\$50,000,000
Interest, ten years, at 5 per cent.	25,000,000
1894 (November)	50,000,000
Interest, nine and one-half years, at 4 per cent.	23,750,000
1895	62,315,400
Interest, thirty years, at 4 per cent.	74,778,480
1896	100,000,000
Interest, twenty-nine years, at 4 per cent.	116,000,000

Total 501,843,880

This \$501,000,000 of new interest-bearing debts is the price the American people are called upon to pay for substituting a Democratic tariff for a Republican tariff. If Harrison had been reelected and the policy of protection had not been interfered with, there would have been no occasion for any borrowing, since the nation would have been abundantly able to meet all its expenditures.

A DARK PICTURE.

The extent of suffering forced upon the people during this era of low tariff can never be adequately pictured by tongue or pen. The curtailment of factory and mercantile operations deprived the employees of their usual incomes, and thus necessitated the use of previous savings which had been deposited largely in the savings banks of the country. In attempting to procure their money thus intrusted to these institutions a panic was caused, which rendered it extremely difficult for them to obtain their funds excepting in dribbles.

There was another large class of people, especially in the larger cities, who suffered severely, people who were living comfortably upon the profits of small stores, residing, as a rule, in the rear of their shops, and selling newspapers, toys, fancy goods, etc.

The income of these people was not cut off immediately, but gradually they found themselves unable to earn sufficient money for support and were forced to draw upon their savings. These people were too proud to beg, and consequently their sufferings were known only to those who by accident or friendship were made acquainted with their circumstances.

Another numerous class of sufferers were the people who had purchased real estate in cities, towns, and rural districts, paying in part therefor, and who finally lost their holdings because of their inability to continue payments according to terms of contract. These people, in their commendable effort to secure for themselves homes, or who sought a better return from their savings by purchasing real estate, will not soon forget the shrinkage in values, the wiping out of equities, and finally the loss of all, during the troublesome times through which they passed.

Numerous societies were formed all over the country to alleviate the sufferings of the people, and various methods were adopted to secure the necessary funds to keep the needy ones from actual starvation. It will also be remembered that during the summer of 1894 an army of workmen, under the lead of Jacob S. Coxey, marched from Ohio to Washington and appeared in the Capitol grounds, demanding Congressional appropriations to furnish labor for the unemployed.

The American Economist of February 2, 1894, contains a picture of a lamp-post, photographed by a member of their staff, styling the same a "Free-trade monument." Upon the lamp-post was fastened a contribution box, over which there was a placard reading, "Free bread fund for the poor," and underneath the picture, "A story without words. Street scene in New York, corner Seventh avenue and One hundred and twenty-fifth street, January 1, 1894."

DEMOCRATIC TESTIMONY.

Upon this subject, Senator David B. Hill (Democrat), of New York, declared:

The extreme reduction of tariff duties at a time when the Treasury was swollen with a surplus of a hundred million dollars, when the country was reasonably prosperous, when all our industries were in motion and all our workmen were employed, assumes a different aspect and presents a different question when proposed now, with a large and growing Treasury deficit staring us in the face, with our industries paralyzed, our manufactories closed, our workmen idle, and following upon the heels of one of the most disastrous financial panics in our history. What was safe and prudent and wise then it would be criminal folly to attempt now. * * * The past savings of our skillful workmen are drawn down. They think themselves lucky to get half-time employment in these dark days; the less skillful laborers by the hundred thousand are suffering hunger, willing but unable to earn their daily bread. It is heartbreaking as a pestilence. * * *

In the face of the prostration of private industries, and in the presence of such a paralysis of all general business as the Treasury deficit attests, a bill as framed by its authors and passed by the House, sought to double the deficit by discarding the customs revenue and to fill the void with an income tax.

The New York World of March 13, 1894, contained a picture of the "millionth loaf" that had been distributed through its free bread fund as a direct result of the election of Grover Cleveland and his free-trade Congress, which the World advocated in 1892.

The following is an extract from the New York World of August 13, 1894, bearing the headlines of "A summer of suffering:"

From day to day the World has been telling of the cases of starvation in this city. There is another index of it—the line in front of Fleischmann's bakery, just below Grace Church, on Broadway. Every night at midnight the proprietor gives the bread left from yesterday's baking to all who ask. Three hours earlier the line begins to form. These poor wretches are willing to wait hours to get their food five minutes earlier. Some nights the line is two blocks long.

In the same issue of the same paper there was a portrait of a young man named Frank Kanapa, who died from starvation in Bellevue Hospital after losing several positions and then seeking employment which he could not find. In this connection it should be remembered that the World advocated the Wilson tariff law, the operations of which succeeded in transferring so many opportunities for work from this country to Europe that it left our working people in utter misery.

ANOTHER INDUSTRIAL CENSUS.

In September, 1894, in response to many demands made upon the American Protective Tariff League for facts and figures regarding the operations of the Wilson tariff, it was decided to undertake a census which should show the situation then existing. The investigation covered the period from January 1 to June 30, 1892, and also the same months of 1894. Replies from 39 different States and Territories were carefully compiled and arranged, first according to the States and Territories from which they were received, and then the compilation was condensed according to the section of the country, showing the aggregate results of the information from each section. This indicated the per cent of losses to labor or wages and the loss of output in each section of the country, also the average wages throughout each section.

The result of this investigation showed that there were 45 per cent less wages earned in 1894 than in 1892; that there was literally no work for 30 per cent of the people, and that the output of the factories decreased by 44 per cent, and the average earnings fell off by \$55 per head.

The alarming loss to labor may be partially realized by considering that in the same establishments where there were 69,856 hands employed from January to June, 1892, only 49,060 were employed in 1894, and where \$17,479,987 wages were paid in 1892 only \$9,611,096 were paid in 1894.

ANOTHER PICTURE.

But, Mr. President, it is a relief to turn from these pictures of misery and suffering to the cheer and sunshine which quickly came under the Administration of a Republican President.

Immediately after the inauguration of President McKinley, when Congress in extra session was preparing for a revision of the tariff on strong protection lines, the influence of such action was very decided. It was reflected by an increase of individual deposits in the banks of \$1,669,219,961. From this point the gain was rapid. There was an increase of \$59,000,000 by May 14, and a further increase of \$42,000,000 by July 23, which carried the total above the maximum record of 1892. By October 3 there had been a further increase of \$83,000,000, and on December 15 the individual deposits were \$1,916,680,252, or \$151,207,269 above the total of September 30, 1892.

The report of the Comptroller of the Currency showed that on September 30, 1892, individual deposits in the banks of the country were \$1,765,422,983, and that in October, 1893, they had fallen to \$1,451,124,320. No sooner was the result of the Presidential election of 1896 made known than there was a marvelous change. Confidence was restored; money which had been withdrawn from the banks and placed in private hoards for safety was returned; the demand for gold ceased; currency was almost universally preferred, the net gold in the Treasury being largely augmented, and bank conditions rapidly improved.

In February, 1898, the New York Commercial Advertiser said:

For 1897 bank clearings showed a gain of \$6,000,000,000, or about 12 per cent over 1896. Two hundred railroads, representing 150,000 miles of track, report for 1897 increased earnings of nearly \$90,000,000 over 1896, and in the same period only 13 roads, representing 1,550 miles of track, went into the hands of receivers, against 34 roads, representing 550,000 miles of track, for the preceding year. There were not only 200 less commercial failures in 1897 than in 1896, but the aggregate liabilities were \$90,000,000 less.

The record of the savings banks, as shown in the annual report of the New York State superintendent of banks, made public in March, 1898, showed that there were in the State of New York 131 savings banks, not one of which failed during the previous year. The total amount of deposits in the savings banks on January 1, the report states, was \$766,688,916, a gain during the year of \$48,508,027, or of \$22,085,673 more than was gained during the previous year. At that time the aggregate resources of these institutions were \$869,751,244, the total surplus fund \$122,426,862,

and the number of open accounts 805,280, representing gains for January, 1897, of \$59,577,611 in resources of \$8,772,924 in surplus and of 68,812 in the number of accounts. Comparing further, the gain in resources was almost exactly twice as great in 1897 as in 1896, in surplus considerably more than threefold, and in general accounts more than 60 per cent.

The following is from Dun's Review of January 8, 1898:

In failures 1897 was not only the best year since 1892, but on the whole the best year ever definitely known. With 13,522 failures in number, 11.5 per cent less than in 1896, and \$182,581,221 defaulted liabilities, 84 per cent less than in 1896, the United States banking failures counted for \$23,249,700; and the commercial failures were but 13,551, with liabilities of \$154,332,071, the average number of failures being only 11,559, the lowest ever known except in 1892. This remarkably heavy decrease in failures, with the extremely low average of liabilities, was due to an improvement during the last half year, which has not been equaled in the twenty-three years covered by the quarterly record. The average of liabilities for the failures in the last half of 1897 was only \$9,593, which has never been equaled in any other half year.

Dun's Review for May, 1898, notwithstanding the existence of war with Spain, gives the following record:

Bank clearings at the principal cities show an increase of 17 per cent over last year, and 11.3 per cent over 1892 for the week outside New York, while including New York the week's exchanges have been \$249,000,000, or 14 per cent larger than in 1892. Railway earnings for May up to date show a gain of 13.7 per cent over 1892, and the east-bound tonnage from Chicago in May was 390,879, against 190,341 last year and 211,641 in 1892.

Evidence of exceptional prosperity was shown by the report of the Nebraska Bureau of Industrial Statistics, giving the results of the complete compilation of the mortgage record of that State. The period covered was the last six months of 1897, and the record of mortgages released as compared with those filed is the best showing ever made since the counties began sending in the mortgage reports. The statement given in the report of farm and city mortgages is as follows:

Kind.	Number.	Amount.
Farm mortgages filed	5,673	\$5,576,733
City mortgages filed	2,252	1,890,830
Total mortgages filed	7,925	7,467,563
Farm mortgages released	8,235	7,557,392
City mortgages released	3,990	4,245,918
Total mortgages released	12,204	11,803,310
Excess released	4,279	4,335,747
Percentage released	54	58

The Chicago Inter-Ocean in July, 1893, said:

The statistical report of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, shows a balance of trade in our favor of \$615,259,025, more than double that of any previous year in our history. The value of our exports for the year is more than seven times that of 1895, 25 per cent in excess of the great commercial year of 1892, and \$180,000,000 more than in 1897.

A GREAT GAIN TO LABOR.

The statistics compiled by the New York commissioner of labor for the year 1897 stated that in the first quarter of the year 1897 there were 98,925 men at work, earning an average of \$155.06 each person for the three months. In the next quarter 124,902 were employed, earning \$159.12; in the third quarter the number was 145,626, and the average earnings were \$174.40. In the last quarter the number increased to 153,896, and the earnings averaged \$174.47. These figures were gathered by the working people themselves through their labor organizations and are absolutely reliable.

A THIRD INDUSTRIAL CENSUS.

In 1899 the American Protective Tariff League took another industrial census by the usual method followed by that organization in gathering statistics. Returns were received from 1,957 employers of labor in 39 lines of industry located in 46 States and Territories.

It was found that the number of hands employed in these establishments in March, 1895, under the Wilson tariff was 191,732. The number of hands employed in March, 1899, under the Dingley tariff was 267,486. The amount of wages paid in March, 1895, was \$6,398,044.53, and in 1899, \$9,859,280.38.

Gain for March, 1899 (Dingley tariff) in number of hands employed	75,754
Percentage of gain for March, 1899 (Dingley tariff), in number of hands employed	39.56
Gain for March, 1899 (Dingley tariff), in amount of wages paid	\$3,461,235.85
Percentage of gain for March, 1899 (Dingley tariff), in amount of wages paid	54.09
Average wages per capita for March, 1899 (Dingley tariff)	\$38.86
Average wages per capita for March, 1895 (Wilson tariff)	\$33.36
Gain for March, 1899 (Dingley tariff), in average wages per capita	\$5.50
Percentage of gain for March, 1899 (Dingley tariff), in average rate of wages per capita	10.49

Thus it will be seen that whether the working people gather the facts by their organizations or the Tariff League secures reports from the employers, the same conditions are found to exist.

A WONDERFUL YEAR.

To show the conditions attending the close of the year 1898, I quote from Dun's Review for December:

It is a year beyond parallel and comes to its close with the biggest volume of business ever seen. Enormous transactions at the stock exchange make some difference and heavy railroad earnings, but when all the transportation and speculative interests are eliminated there is still a larger business than in any other month of the year. The last year the exports were in volume greater than in any previous months in the history of the country, but this year the three months' report shows an increase of 25 per cent against 9 per cent in imports, which would indicate much more than \$70,000,000 excess of exports this month. The payments through clearing houses have been for the week 28.5 per cent greater than last year and 12.4 per cent greater than in 1892, and for the month 17.8 per cent larger than in 1892.

The business of the New York clearing houses increased in the month of January from \$2,589,348,832 in 1897 to \$5,690,747,778 in January, 1899, and the banks outside of New York increased from \$1,915,870,146 in January, 1897, to \$2,801,979,029 in January, 1899, thus showing the increase in the business of the clearing houses of the country in a single month between the two years to be \$3,987,507,829.

In the eight months of the fiscal year of 1899 the Treasury Bureau of Statistics reports show a gain in volume of business in iron and steel of 36 per cent over 1898 and nearly 70 per cent over 1897.

The imports and exports of iron and steel and the manufactures thereof were as follows:

Year.	Imports.	Domestic exports.
1896	\$25,338,103	\$41,160,877
1897	16,094,557	57,497,878
1898	12,626,431	70,406,885

Surely, Mr. President, there is no ground for fear about maintaining the gold reserve in the Treasury so long as our imports continue to decrease and our domestic exports to increase in the proportions of the last three years.

MORE TESTIMONY IN FAVOR OF PROTECTION.

The reports received by the New York State factory inspector and his deputies showed that in the course of 9,600 inspections made by them during the month of December, 1898, and January and February, 1899, 373 new firms had gone into the business and that 100 old firms, which had formerly closed up, had resumed business; that 1,119 firms had increased the number of their employees; that 27 firms were working overtime and 20 were working double time.

The following quotation is from an address delivered by President McKinley January 27, 1898, in Cincinnati, at the banquet of the National Association of Manufacturers:

As governor of the State of Ohio it was my pleasure to welcome you to the city of Cincinnati on January 22, 1895, at the initial convention of the Manufacturers' Association. It was a cold day. You had lost everything but your pluck. Courage was the only friend that your grief could call its own. I note with satisfaction your improved appearance now. You are more cheerful in countenance, more buoyant in spirit, more hopeful in manner and confident in purpose. Then, too, there are more of you here. Distances are, of course, the same, but traveling has been resumed. Your speeches and resolutions at that first convention were directed mainly to the question of how to regain what you had lost, or, if that was found impossible, then how to stop further loss. But your object now, as I gather it, is to go out and possess what you never had before. You want to extend, not your notes, but your business. I sympathized with your purposes then; I am in full accord with your intentions now.

The Springfield (Ill.) Journal called attention to the good effects of the Dingley tariff law in these words:

According to the commercial reports fully 500,000 wage-earners have been benefited by the industrial activity that has followed the inauguration of a Republican Administration and the enactment of a protective tariff law. Increases in wages have never followed the induction into office of a Democratic President.

The St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, in January, 1899, alluded to the prosperous condition of the country, as follows:

If there is still anyone who doubts that 1898 was a prosperous year, the following concise statement of the records in the various lines of business that are fundamental and indicative of commercial activity ought to be convincing. The comparison in every instance refers to the United States alone:

1. Largest wheat crop except that of 1891.
2. Highest price recorded for wheat except in 1898.
3. Largest cotton crop.
4. Largest export of breadstuffs.
5. Largest export of manufactured goods.
6. Largest aggregate exports of produce and merchandise.
7. Largest production of iron ore.
8. Largest production of pig iron.
9. Largest production of coal.
10. Largest production of copper.
11. Largest production of silver except that of 1892.
12. Largest production of gold.
13. Largest gold holdings.
14. Largest per capita circulation of all forms of money.
15. Largest aggregate bank clearings.
16. Largest aggregate railroad earnings.
17. Largest sales of bonds.
18. Largest aggregate sales of stocks on the New York Stock Exchange since 1882.
19. Smallest number of failures and smallest aggregate liabilities since 1892.

This indicates beyond question the beneficial effects of the McKinley Administration and its tariff law as against the policies of the Cleveland Administration, which enervated the people, reduced their resources, and paralyzed the industries of the country.

The Tacoma (Wash.) Ledger in March, 1899, said:

The general advance in wages is an evidence that prosperity has become general instead of being confined to certain classes. * * * Where two years ago hundreds of thousands of workmen were idle they are now employed, and their wages have kept pace with the increased cost of living. * * * The advance agent did not belie his show; everything advertised in the bill has been exhibited.

The American Economist of March 24, 1899, pointed out that the—

Trade reports from all over the country continue to tell of remarkable business activity, with prices strong and steady, collections good, and increasing demand in all lines of trade. One correspondent in a trade paper sized up the situation as a "buyers' panic." That is the kind of a panic that a protective tariff always brings about. In 1893, under the free-trade Administration of Mr. Cleveland, with its Wilson-Gorman tariff-reform law, we had another kind of a panic, the kind that has always followed upon any experiment made with free trade or any approach to it by this country, a panic when banks failed, factories closed, business men went to the wall, and idle workmen walked the streets.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, in the course of a review of the industrial conditions of five Northwestern States, said that the four years of depression had been quickly followed by a business revival never equaled in the history of the country; that the improvement had continued for two years, and that evidences of renewed prosperity were daily increasing. The article continued as follows:

New industries have been established having capital of at least \$14,753,150, and the plants are valued at \$13,291,600. The value of the annual output of these new industries in round figures is \$76,532,488. These plants give employment to 16,436 persons, and pay out annually in wages \$10,156,601. These totals, as large as they are, are small compared with the aggregate which a complete showing of the commercial expansion in all lines would present. There is no doubt but that the figures would reach into the hundreds of millions, were it possible to ascertain the exact amount invested in commerce, agriculture, and mining in the States thus partly covered in the reports received from the 54 towns making up this enumeration.

The following from the Chicago Inter Ocean is an interesting item of evidence on this subject:

No free-trade or Democratic journal has ventured to deny that business and industrial conditions have greatly improved under the Dingley law. No speaker at any of the Jackson or Jefferson banquets attempted to break the force of the story of prosperity told in the figures of Government reports. One Democratic newspaper has been at pains to collect statistics showing that 700,000 wage-earners are drawing increased pay as a result of improved trade conditions.

The American Economist of June 30, 1899, said:

Pittsburg reports that the usual summer shut-down will not occur this year, as manufacturers must keep going to fill orders booked. This condition of things prevails very generally throughout the country. There never was a time when so much money was being paid out in wages and when wages were uniformly so satisfactory to the wage-earners.

In February, 1899, the Democratic New York World said editorially:

All records were broken by the total ordinary customs receipts for the month of January just passed. The Schuylkill Coal Exchange has just placed the rate of pay for miners at a point surpassed but once in twenty-five years. These are extreme details in a story of general prosperity almost unexampled in America. The good times have affected everybody, and the promise of their continuance is such as to increase the cheer in all hearts.

GREATLY INCREASED EXPORTS.

Mr. President, I have presented what must be conceded to be a surprising exhibit of contrasts between conditions existing under tariffs framed on free-trade lines and tariffs framed in harmony with the principle of protection, but it is not more surprising than the exhibit which relates to our national trade and commerce. The showing in this regard has attracted the attention and excited the astonishment of the civilized world. Nothing like it has ever before been known in the history of nations.

Starting with 1892, the first full year of hitherto unequalled prosperity under the workings of the McKinley tariff, our exports of domestic merchandise for the first time reached the billion-dollar mark. For that year the exports were \$1,015,732,011, and the imports were \$827,402,462. In 1893, the first year of Cleveland and tariff reform, our exports fell off \$170,000,000 and our imports increased \$40,000,000. In 1895, when the Wilson free-trade tariff had gotten in its deadly work, exports fell to \$793,392,590, and our visible trade balance fell from \$173,000,000 in 1892 to only a little over \$60,000,000 in 1895. Not until 1897, after the restoration of the protective policy, did we again touch the billion mark in our export trade. That year the total of exports was \$1,032,007,603, against imports of \$764,730,412, leaving a favorable trade balance of \$267,277,191.

The fiscal year of 1898, the first year of the Dingley tariff, saw a tremendous advance in our sales of American products to foreign consumers. For 1898 the total of exports was \$1,210,291,913, while our imports had fallen from \$866,400,922 in 1893 to \$616,049,654 in 1898. Here was a trade balance which startled the world. It amounted to \$594,242,259. For 1899 (fiscal year) the exports aggregated \$1,203,931,222 and the imports \$697,148,489, leaving a trade balance of over \$500,000,000, or upward of \$1,100,000,000 for two consecutive years.

But the brightest and best part of this wonderful story of expanding trade and commerce remains to be told. Under the wise policy of insuring to the domestic producer the control of the domestic market we began to accomplish the impossible—that is, what our free-trade friends had pronounced impossible. We began to invade the markets of the world with our manufactured products. How successful that invasion was is told in the official statistics of our sales of American manufactured products for the decade of fiscal years commencing with 1890 and ending with 1899. For the first four years of that decade we bought from foreigners more than double the manufactures we sold to them.

In 1890 the imports of this character were, in round numbers, \$356,000,000, and the exports \$151,000,000. Neither the totals nor the proportions varied materially until 1894, when, in anticipation of the lower duties soon to come under a free-trade Administration, imports fell off to \$237,000,000, while exports rose to \$183,000,000. The domestic manufacturer was working off at cut prices his surplus stocks, which American consumers were too poor to buy. In 1896 we bought of foreigners \$333,000,000 and sold to them \$228,000,000 of manufactured goods. In 1897 we bought less (\$204,000,000) and sold more (\$277,000,000). The Dingley tariff then began to show its value to industry, trade, and commerce. In 1898 the imports of manufactures dropped to \$230,000,000, because the domestic producer was furnishing an increased proportion and foreigners a decreased proportion of the goods consumed by Americans.

But this was not all. Our exports of manufactures in that year rose to \$290,000,000, and for the first time in our history we sold the outside world more manufactured goods than we bought. The difference in our favor was about \$60,000,000. For the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1899, this grand record was surpassed. While we increased to \$259,000,000 the amount of foreign goods bought, because our people were now better able to indulge their taste for luxuries of foreign production, we increased to \$338,667,794 our sales of manufactured goods to the outside world.

We had sold \$80,000,000 more than we had bought. And we did even better in the first eight months of the current fiscal year. For this period our exports of manufactures aggregate \$268,537,972, being an average of \$33,567,000 per month, more than a million dollars per day, against a monthly average of \$28,222,000 for the preceding fiscal year. At this rate our exports of manufactures for the current fiscal year will reach the splendid total of \$402,804,000.

In 1890 our exports of manufactures formed 16.6 per cent of our total exports. In 1900 the percentage has risen to 29.7, or almost double the proportion of ten years ago. This is the record, after two years and a half of restored protection of American labor and industry, of a country which free traders used to tell us was destined by Providence to sell to the outside world food stuffs and raw materials exclusively. Singular thwarting of what they called "manifest destiny!"

Here we are, at the end of the century, the leading industrial nation of the world, second by only a few millions of dollars in the race for commercial supremacy, and year by year piling up huge trade balances which have already made us a creditor nation instead of a debtor nation, and which must soon make us the leading creditor nation in Christendom. That these tremendous changes in wealth, credit, commerce, and industry are in great measure the outgrowth of our national policy of protection now stands admitted by fair-minded, thoughtful men the world over. Almost the only people on earth who dispute this fact are the free traders of our own country. But the American free trader is neither thoughtful nor fair-minded. He could not be thoughtful and fair-minded and remain a free trader.

Mr. President, I have reflected the true conditions under the Wilson-Gorman tariff era, and also the true conditions under the Dingley tariff. I have quoted from no publication which did not describe the existing conditions fairly, and in quoting from these publications I have added unimpeachable evidence to the truthfulness of my own statements. In conclusion, I make a quotation from the American Economist of April 14, 1899, entitled "The glory of protection," by Edwin A. Hartshorn, and there leave the subject for the thoughtful consideration of all classes of our people. Mr. Hartshorn said:

As surely as the heavens declare the glory of God, so surely our present economic conditions declare the glory of protection. A comparison of our industrial situation under the last national Administration with present conditions must result in unqualified condemnation of a tariff for revenue with incidental protection and unqualified commendation of a tariff for protection with incidental revenue.

The first two of the four years last past clearly demonstrated that idle people can not largely consume the products of foreign labor. The last two of the same four years have demonstrated that busy people can consume not only the products of their own labor, but in addition thereto can purchase more foreign products than when idleness is thrust upon them by vicious industrial laws.

History fails to record a more striking proof that the benediction of Omnipotence rests upon those who strive to help themselves than has been demonstrated by recent events in the United States. A marvelous transformation from plenty to poverty, and then again from poverty to plenty, has been wrought within the memory of the youngest citizen who will cast his ballot at the next national election.

Under the last half of President Cleveland's Administration the McKinley tariff produced an abundance of revenue and created an era justly termed "the high-water mark of national prosperity." Under the following Administration the Wilson tariff failed as a revenue producer and sent the nation headlong into an era justly termed "the low-water mark of national adversity." During the first two years of President McKinley's Administration the Dingley tariff has started again the wheels of industry and given back the work and wages of the McKinley tariff era.

Inasmuch as immediately following the Harrison era of prosperity and immediately preceding the McKinley era of restored prosperity there came an era of industrial depression unprecedented in the nation's history, surely Professor Wilson's tariff for revenue with incidental protection was fairly weighed and found utterly wanting.

While the magic wand of the wizard of the Northwest was yet pointing to clipped dollars and repudiation as the only relief from the miseries into which the wizard himself had helped to plunge us, the Dingley tariff gave back employment to labor, faith to capital, hope to business, joy to the people, and revenue to the nation.

In the long struggle for industrial independence, when William D. Kelley, of Pennsylvania, the father of protection, died in the thickest of the fight, his mantle fell upon William McKinley, of Ohio, under whose magnificent leadership victory came for the American standard of wages and living.

When the champion of a great principle lives to see the triumph of the cause for which he has contended, it is appropriate that thanksgiving be rendered and poems sung. Let us therefore rejoice that from the highest position within the gift of a grateful people President McKinley sees the glorious banner of industrial independence waving from the masthead of our magnificent ship of state, there to remain so long as American citizens are true to America's greatest glory.

Mr. President, it is gratifying to know that the prosperity so vividly pictured by Mr. Hartshorn one year ago has continued to the present moment, giving comfort and happiness to the American people, and adding another object lesson to the long list of those which the history of our country has produced. Let us hope that the beneficent results of protection may long continue to bless the labor and the industries of the United States.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR INTERNAL-REVENUE STAMPS.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the Senate bill in relation to the reimbursement of collectors of internal revenue now on the table with certain House amendments be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2657) to reimburse sundry collectors of internal revenue for internal-revenue stamps paid for and charged in their accounts and not received by them.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

JOHN L. SMITHMEYER AND PAUL J. PELZ.

Mr. STEWART. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 186) for the relief of John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill indicated by him. The bill has been read. Is there objection to its present consideration?

Mr. BATE. I suggest that the bill had better be read, so that we may know what it is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been read once. It will be read again.

The Secretary read the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. I understood that the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] desired to discuss the bill, and he is absent.

Mr. STEWART. I have been laboring for two sessions to get a hearing on the bill, and I shall have to move to take it up. It is a very meritorious case. I think the Senator's colleague [Mr. HOAR] understood it the other day. He stated that all of the difficulty arose, as it did, out of the inflexible honesty of Mr. Smithmeyer. I have been now two sessions trying to get the bill through.

Mr. LODGE. I did not rise to object to the bill, but simply to say that I know the Senator from Maine desires to be heard in regard to it, and I do not think it should be called up in his absence.

Mr. STEWART. If we keep letting it go, we will never get it up. The Senator from Maine was here the other day when it was discussed, and he did not take part in the discussion.

Mr. LODGE. I know that he objects to the bill very much, and other Senators do. I do not know where the Senator from Maine is just now. After what he said to me, as he is absent, I do not think the bill should be considered.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. Possibly that will bring the Senator from Maine into the Chamber.

Mr. STEWART. That may bring him in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allison,	Berry,	Clark, Wyo.	Fairbanks,
Bacon,	Caffery,	Clay,	Foraker,
Bard,	Carter,	Cockrell,	Foster,
Bate,	Chandler,	Deboe,	Frye,

Gallinger,
Gear,
Hanna,
Hawley,
Jones, Ark.
Jones, Nev.
Kenney,
Kyle,
Lindsay,

Lodge,
McBride,
McComas,
McCumber,
McEnery,
Mallory,
Martin,
Morgan,
Nelson,

Perkins,
Platt, Conn.
Platt, N. Y.
Quarles,
Ross,
Shoup,
Simon,
Spooner,
Stewart,

Taliaferro,
Teller,
Tillman,
Turley,
Turner,
Wellington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-nine Senators have responded to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill which will be read in full to the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. The bill is well known. In the absence of the Senator from Maine, knowing as I do what his views are in regard to the bill, I feel constrained to object to its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts objects.

MARY A. SWIFT.

Mr. STEWART. I ask leave to make a report of a bill which passed the Senate. The same bill in the same language passed the House, but the two Houses did not pass the same bill. This is the House bill, and it is a short bill. I ask that it be put upon its passage. The Senate has passed the same bill in the same language.

Mr. COCKRELL. Does it come from the committee?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; the Senate committee reported the same bill, and the Senate passed it on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is another bill?

Mr. STEWART. It is another bill, a House bill. I am directed by the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6749) for the relief of Mary A. Swift, to report it without amendment, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read in full to the Senate for its information.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$12,000 be, and is hereby appropriated, out of the money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the relief of Mary A. Swift, widow of the late John F. Swift, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Japan, said amount being the salary allowed by law to the above-named office for one year.

Mr. BACON. What is the amount involved?

Mr. STEWART. Twelve thousand dollars.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the payment for?

Mr. STEWART. He died, and this is an allowance of a year's salary. It is the custom in all such cases. The same bill was reported from the Committee on Claims by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] and passed, and then the House passed the bill in the same language, but this is the House bill that has come here. So each House has passed the same bill in the same language.

Mr. COCKRELL. How much does the bill carry?

Mr. STEWART. Twelve thousand dollars.

Mr. COCKRELL. What was he doing, that he got that salary?

Mr. STEWART. He was minister to Japan.

Mr. TELLER. I understand that the House passed this bill before the Senate bill got over there, and that is the reason probably why it comes in this form.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada if this man died in office?

Mr. STEWART. So I understand.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It seems to me we ought to know the fact. If this man was at one time minister to Japan and died somewhere else, it is a very different case from his dying in office. I do not remember the fact of any minister to Japan dying while in office.

Mr. TELLER. It was some years ago.

Mr. STEWART. He died in office some years ago.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The committee ought to know the fact.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is there a report?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Let the report be read.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us hear the report.

Mr. STEWART. The report was made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Let the report be read.

Mr. STEWART. It is the report accompanying the Senate bill.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I think the bill had better go over, so that we can look at it.

Mr. STEWART. Let it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. ALLISON. I think in the meantime the Senator from Nevada ought to ask the House for the return of the Senate bill, so that both bills will not be passed.

Mr. COCKRELL. I suggest to the Senator to submit a motion calling on the House to return the Senate bill.

Mr. STEWART. I move that the House be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 3476) for the relief of Mary A. Swift.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada enters a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed Senate bill 3476 and moves that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEWART subsequently said: If the Senator from Massachusetts will yield now, I think the Swift matter can be disposed of, because the information that was called for is here.

Mr. LODGE. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. STEWART. The report shows:

The bill under consideration is for the relief of Mary A. Swift, widow of the late Hon. John F. Swift, who was appointed envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Japan March 16, 1889, and died in that country during the second year of his incumbency of that office, March 10, 1891.

Here is a long list of precedents, and all the precedents have been uniform, where these allowances have been made. A special allowance was made to the widow of General Hurlbut, who died while minister to Peru, and an allowance was also made to the widow of General Fitzpatrick, who died while minister to Chile. She received one year's salary. And so on, through about ten or fifteen cases.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada asks for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

C. R. DICKSON.

Mr. BACON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 4085) to correct the military record of C. R. Dickson. It is a bill which I presume will lead to no debate. It is reported from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TELLER. What is the Calendar number?

Mr. BACON. It was only reported this morning and consequently is not on the printed Calendar. It was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs and is accompanied by a report.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], who is always very watchful about these bills and has insisted that I should conform to the usual custom, if a proviso that it shall not carry pay and allowances, etc., should not be inserted in the bill?

Mr. COCKRELL. We generally put that in; but if I remember this case correctly, it relates to service in the last war.

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. COCKRELL. And it is the case of a court-martial when the man was sentenced and ordered to be dismissed.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. COCKRELL. I thought the bill was in the form we usually have them in, and that the Secretary of War was authorized to review and revoke the sentence of dismissal so as to clear his record and issue him an honorable discharge. He still stands convicted under this bill as being guilty of the offense and yet will have an honorable discharge.

Mr. CHANDLER. What report is there? I think the report had better be read.

Mr. COCKRELL. The form of bill we have always adopted in the Military Committee (and I do not know why this was not in exactly the same form) was to authorize the Secretary of War to review and revoke the sentence of dismissal and then to issue an honorable discharge.

Mr. BACON. The Senator from Missouri is very much more familiar with these matters than I am. This is a very meritorious case. A boy 17 years of age was dealt with very cruelly by a court-martial after he had completed his military service.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the report be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

Mr. BACON. I was going to suggest that if the Senator from Missouri thinks it important I will yield to his superior judgment in this matter and ask that the bill be allowed to remain until an amendment can be prepared to conform to the suggestion of the Senator.

With that view I ask leave to withdraw the request for the consideration of the bill at present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2355) in relation to the suppression of insurrection in, and to the government of, the Philippine Islands, ceded by Spain to the United States by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898.

Mr. LODGE. I have refrained from pressing the consideration of that bill and allowed it to remain the unfinished business because I desired, in the first place, to do everything that I could to aid in the passage of the Alaskan bill, which I thought of great importance, and also that we might dispose of some of the great appropriation bills.

I desire to give notice that on Monday I shall hope to go on with the bill and ask the Senate to dispose of it. It has been now for some time upon the Calendar. There has been ample opportunity for discussion. While I have no desire to cut off anyone or to ask anything unreasonable, I do think we ought to take a vote on the bill and dispose of it, so as to clear the way for other business.

Of course, in giving this notice I wish it to be understood that I do not propose to do anything with the bill to interfere in any way with the consideration of the Clark case.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts asks that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD LANDS.

Mr. NELSON. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4306) for the relief of settlers and other claimants under the public-land laws to lands within the indemnity limits of the grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments, on page 2, line 2, after the word "settlers," to strike out "or other claimants," and at the end of the bill to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That this act shall only apply to lands which the said company would be entitled to as indemnity land within the terms of said grant, and where the railroad has been completed.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of July 1, 1893, appearing in thirty-third Statutes at Large, at pages 620, 621, and 622, providing a plan for the adjustment by the Land Department of conflicting claims to lands within the limits of the grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company, are hereby extended and made applicable to all instances where lands in odd-numbered sections within the indemnity limits of the grant to said company were patented to settlers under the public-land laws subsequent to August 15, 1887, and prior to July 1, 1898, in pursuance of applications presented to or proceedings initiated in, the local land office at a time when the land was included within an existing Executive withdrawal on account of said grant or at a time when it was embraced in a pending indemnity selection made by said company in conformity with the regulations of the Land Department, which indemnity selection has not since been waived or abandoned: *Provided*, That this act shall only apply to lands which the said company would be entitled to as indemnity land within the terms of said grant, and where the railroad has been completed.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. BERRY. I thought the words "or other claimants" were stricken out.

Mr. NELSON. They were stricken out in the body of the bill. I will have the title amended to correspond.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not understand that the words have been stricken out.

Mr. NELSON. They are stricken out in the body of the bill.

Mr. BERRY. That was ordered by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first amendment made as in Committee of the Whole will be again stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 2, after the word "settlers," strike out "or other claimants."

Mr. BERRY. That was the order of the committee.

Mr. NELSON. Those words have been stricken out in the body of the bill, and I shall move to have the title amended to correspond.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of settlers under the public-land laws to lands within the indemnity limits of the grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company."

EDWARD EVERETT HAYDEN.

Mr. LODGE. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2884) for the relief of Edward Everett Hayden, an ensign on the retired list of the Navy.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 16, after the word "Provided," to strike out:

That he shall receive no pay or emolument by reason of such reappointment to the active list of the Navy except from the date of such reappointment.

And to insert:

That the said Hayden shall establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy, upon examination by a board of officers convened pursuant to the provisions of section 1496 of the Revised Statutes, his mental, moral, and professional fitness to perform the shore duties of a lieutenant, and before a medical board, pursuant to the provisions of sections 1493 and 1494 of said statutes, that his existing physical disqualification was occasioned by wounds received in the line of his duty, and that such wounds do not incapacitate him for duties other than sea duty in the grade of lieutenant: *And provided further*, That he shall receive no pay or emoluments by reason of such reappointment to the active list of the Navy except from the date of such reappointment, and that he shall be additional to the number of officers prescribed by law for the grade of lieutenant in the Navy, and in any grade to which he may hereafter be advanced.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

PROPOSED NATIONAL PARK IN MINNESOTA.

Mr. QUARLES. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 111) concerning certain Chippewa Indian reservations in Minnesota, a joint resolution unanimously reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides for the creation of a commission consisting of the chairmen of the Committees on Indian Affairs and Public Lands of the Senate and House of Representatives, and five members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker, to investigate the question whether it is practicable and desirable for the United States to create a national park upon and within the lands known as the reservations of the Mississippi Chippewas, Leech Lake, Winnebagoishish, and Cass Lake Indians, in Minnesota, the lands comprising an area of about 830,063 acres, including Leech, Winnebagoishish, Cass, and numerous smaller lakes, together with the Mississippi and other rivers and streams, comprising about one-fourth of the entire tract as water area.

Mr. HOAR. From whom does that joint resolution come?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. QUARLES] has called it up.

Mr. QUARLES. I will state to the Senator that the joint resolution has been favorably reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs. The proposition is to make arrangements to preserve part of that forest up there before it is destroyed.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMERICAN REGISTER FOR BARGE DAVIDSON.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of the bill (S. 3301) to provide an American register for the barge *Davidson*.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read in full for the information of the Senate, subject to objection.

The bill was read; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the foreign-built barge *Ringhorn*, owned by James T. O'Donnell, a citizen of the United States, to be registered as a vessel of the United States under the name of *Davidson*.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1290) to provide for the erection of a public building at San Francisco, in the State of California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read in full for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

The first amendment was to strike out sections 1 and 2, as follows:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to cause the present post-office site on Battery, between Washington and Jackson streets, in the city of San Francisco, in the State of California, to be examined by competent officers immediately upon the passage of this act, for the purpose of determining whether it is conveniently located and otherwise suitable in size and foundation for the erection of a custom-house building thereon; and if it shall be determined by the said Secretary, upon such examination, that the site is in all respects suitable for that purpose, then to cause to be erected thereon, with all convenient dispatch, a commodious fireproof building of modern style and structure for the use of the collector of customs and other officers of the Government; but if it shall be determined that the site is not suitable for the proposed building, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase forthwith, at private sale or by condemnation, a convenient and suitable site in said city of San Francisco for the immediate erection of a custom-house building thereon: *Provided*, That the cost of such site shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby further authorized and directed to have promptly prepared, as soon as a site shall be determined upon as herein provided, full and complete plans, specifications, and detail drawings of the building to be erected, and for that purpose to employ a skilled architect in San Francisco to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for said building, and for the architectural supervision of its construction: *Provided*, That a sum not to exceed \$25,000 is hereby appropriated for the employment of such skilled architect to prepare the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings, as herein provided.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be erected a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, for the use and accommodation of the United States custom-house and other Government offices, on the present post-office site on Battery, between Washington and Jackson streets, in the city of San Francisco and State of California, the cost of said building, including said vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, complete, not to exceed the sum of \$1,500,000.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to contract with the lowest and best bidder, after reasonable notice by advertisement in one or more of the newspapers of said city of largest circulation, for the sale of the present building, and the removal of same from the site as described in section 1.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 4, as follows:

SEC. 4. That the entire cost of said building, when completed, shall not exceed the sum of \$3,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE AT PIERRE, S. DAK.

Mr. KYLE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9559) to provide for the construction of a bridge by the Duluth, Pierre and Black Hills Railroad Company across the Missouri River at Pierre, S. Dak. I will state that the bill is in the ordinary form, and I am sure there will be no objection to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill named by him, which will be read in full for the information of the Senate.

The bill was read; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, in section 3, line 21, after the words "Secretary of War," to insert:

And if any bridge erected under said authority shall, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, obstruct such navigation, he is hereby authorized to cause such change or alteration of said bridge to be made as will effectually obviate such obstruction, and all such alterations shall be made and all such obstructions be removed at the expense of the said corporation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

WESTERN PAVING AND SUPPLY COMPANY.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1374.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the bill referred to by the Senator from Indiana in full for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 1374) appropriating money to pay the claim of the Western Paving and Supply Company.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know that I shall object to the consideration of this bill, but I understand it to be one of a series of claims which have been long pending against the United States for paving around public buildings.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. This claim received the consideration of the Senate at the last session of Congress, and was then passed by the Senate.

Mr. ALLISON. But it is for paving around a public building in Indianapolis.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLISON. The United States has not for many years paid for paving around public buildings, and if it is done at Indianapolis, of course it will have to be done wherever we have a public building. I submit to the Senator that it is rather a bad precedent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ALLISON. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the bill goes over.

CUSTOMS INSPECTORS AT NEW YORK.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 2006.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, which will be read in full for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 2006) fixing the compensation of customs inspectors at the port of New York in lieu of extra compensation for night services hereafter to be rendered in the examination of baggage, and for other purposes; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides that the inspectors of customs at the port of New York shall be paid at the rate of \$5 per diem, and may be assigned to the examination of the baggage and effects of passengers arriving from a foreign port after sunset without further compensation, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe; but nothing in this act shall be deemed to permit the master, owner, agent, or consignee of a vessel arriving from a foreign port to receive a permit to unlade such vessel after sunset, except under existing Treasury regulations or such as may hereafter be imposed.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SCHOOLS OF MINING AND METALLURGY.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 3982.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read in full for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 3982) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the sale of the public lands to the endowment, support, and maintenance of schools or departments of mining and metallurgy in the several States and Territories in connection with the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Mines and Mining with amendments, in section 2, on page 2, line 10, before the word "instruction," to insert "geological;" in the same line, before the word "research," to insert "and;" in line 11, before the words "and metallurgy," to strike out "and experiment in mining" and insert "mining engineering;" in line 12, after the word "including," to strike out "English and other modern languages and;" and in line 13, before the word "physical," to strike out "mathematical;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That said appropriations shall be expended only for geological instruction and research, mining engineering and metallurgy and the branches of learning pertaining thereto, including the various branches of physical, natural, and economic science and the facilities for such instruction, research, and experiment, in order to promote a liberal and practical education and secure the most intelligent use, conservation, and development of the mineral resources of the country.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina what is the proportion in which these grants are to be made among the different States and Territories? What is the amount of money? Is it equal?

Mr. TILLMAN. It is actually equal, just the same as under the Morrill Act.

Mr. HOAR. I take a very great interest in this general subject, and I suppose every other Senator does, for that matter; but I wish to ask the Senator from South Carolina whether he feels assured that this same amount of money ought to be paid over equally to all the States and Territories without any distinction as to their condition or the wants of their people? For instance, is it as valuable to science and to the mining interests of the country to have as large a sum paid for a school of mines in Vermont or Massachusetts or New Hampshire, where they have no mines to speak of, as it is in Colorado or in California or Nevada, where the practical application of the student's work is all about him; that is, in other words, are you going to have the same demand for that kind of instruction from persons at a distance from the mining region that you are from persons brought up in the mining region? I do not make this inquiry by way of objection to the bill, but I only think it is a point which deserves explanation.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is largely a matter of opinion, I presume, as to the relative advantages of this appropriation. Pursuing the policy that the Government has hitherto adopted of distributing its donation or bonus equally among the States, in the last two appropriations \$15,000 for experimental stations and \$25,000 for the supplementing of the endowment to the land-grant colleges were given, the States and Territories will all receive the benefits equally. The original land-grant act of 1862 proportioned the donation among the States in accordance with their population by giving 30,000 acres of land, I think it was, to each State for each Representative in Congress, but the last two acts have given the donation to the States equally, just like the States are represented here equally.

But in regard to the other branch of the subject, the question of where the demand for mining instruction is greatest I do not

think cuts much figure. There are very few States that have not got more or less mineral wealth. A great deal of it is undeveloped, of course. A great many States have minerals of which their own people have no knowledge. The question of instruction in those branches of learning, however, is one which, while it is locally valuable by reason of directing attention to the necessity for drill in mining engineering and metallurgy and road building and all that sort of thing, does not merit consideration as much as furnishing the means of educating people close at home.

For instance, if you will take Vermont and establish a school of mines in its agricultural college, and the boys of Vermont become mining engineers in that school, if there are no mines in Vermont, those boys will go where there are mines, and therefore they will get the necessary training to advance the general welfare of the United States, which, I take it, is the object of the donations, while furnishing a profession to the boys, to look to the development of the mineral industries of the entire country wherever they are located.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me just a word in that connection? We have an agricultural college in my little State. It is very prosperous. A very large sum of money was left to it by a wealthy citizen some years ago, in addition to what the Government has done for it. I chance to know that the president of that college, as well as the students, are very anxious for the passage of the bill just as it stands. The claim on their part is precisely what the Senator has suggested. They get this education, and they go out into the world and use it.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will call the Senator's attention to this phase of the subject, that unless they get the education at home they can not go to Nevada or Alabama or Colorado to study mining, because they are getting their general instruction while they are getting this specific, technical instruction right at home.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is the point I wanted to make. They want to get this education and then go out into the world and make use of it and get employment.

Mr. HOAR. I have been in the Senate or the House on two or three occasions when these grants for colleges have been made, and they are of so much interest and so much public importance that I never have felt justified in embarrassing, still less in endangering, the passage of any of them by objecting to the policy which the committee, on the whole, thought was best. I do not propose to do it now; but at the same time it does seem to me that there ought to be some discretion, either in the States or in the authorities of the particular institutions, as to which of the great subjects pursued there should be cultivated with the most emphasis or preference, and that there should not be a rigid rule provided by Congress of equality among the States.

Now, the interest of Massachusetts is mechanical and manufacturing largely. We want to have, for the purposes of the industries of my own State, men trained in the technical schools, who will carry to the bench of the workman, to the lathe, to the steam engine the knowledge of applied mechanics and applied mathematics and chemistry, which helps him in that vocation. We have two admirable schools that are beneficiaries of the Government under the original bill and the subsequent legislation—the School of Technology of Boston, which was presided over by General Walker with such brilliant success, and the Agricultural College at Amherst.

Mr. HAWLEY. I wish you would add to that the scientific school at Hartford.

Mr. HOAR. That is not in Massachusetts.

Mr. HAWLEY. You are confining it to Massachusetts? I thought you were speaking about the country generally.

Mr. HOAR. I was speaking only of my own State.

With the share that Massachusetts gets we are educating farmers, who very largely go out of the State to find better farms than we can give them on our sterile soil, and we are educating them in other branches. We say, "We ought to have some discretion, at least, in the expenditure of the funds, inasmuch as our State contributes its share, to educate boys for our own immediate industries," instead of educating Massachusetts boys so that they will go off into the rest of the country and make their education available for their own fortune and for the service of the country.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will permit me right here, if that policy had been pursued in the past, Massachusetts would not have had that vast hold and influence in this country which she now possesses by reason of the migration beyond her borders of her sons who have been educated at home.

Mr. HOAR. That is another thing. We paid for that education, whatever it was. We did not ask any help. But what I have to say—and I wish the Senator would be assured of the absolute sincerity with which I say it—

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not at all question that.

Mr. HOAR. I mean about my support of the bill. I do not wish to interfere with the policy which the wisdom of this committee has adopted. I shall move no amendment and make no debate, but I do think that when the committee or the Senate

deals with this question in the future there ought to be some elasticity in the objects to which funds in particular States are devoted. I believe it would be to the interest of the youth of Massachusetts if they were not tied down to an agricultural or mining education, but had an education more directly and specifically aimed at the things which the youth of Massachusetts are to do at home.

Mr. STEWART. I will state that the representatives of these institutions, a large number of them, have been here a large portion of the winter, and every one of them from agricultural States, not mining States. This question was discussed. We listened to them. The bill was reported mainly on their earnest solicitation.

Mr. HOAR. I do not wish to set up my judgment against that of these gentlemen, but I have been for a great many years a trustee of the most successful technical school in this country, one of the most famous, and I have studied that question as thoroughly as I have any question. I do not wish to interfere with the bill. I wish to put this observation on record as my opinion.

Mr. ALLISON obtained the floor.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me, there are two or three amendments that have been suggested to me by various members of the Senate and agreed to by the committee, which I should like to have inserted as perfecting the bill, and then if he has any suggestions to offer I will be glad to hear him.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. TILLMAN. I move to amend section 2, on page 2, lines 10 and 11, by striking out the word "and," after "instruction," and to change the word "research" to another place lower down, which I will mention in a minute; strike out the word "and," after "engineering," in line 11; and then, after the word "metallurgy," insert "research in road-building material and its proper application;" so as to read:

That said appropriations shall be expended only for geological instruction, mining, mining engineering, metallurgy, research in road-building material, and its proper application, etc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. TILLMAN. In lines 21 and 22, section 3, page 2, strike out "Territorial university or other like Territorial institution" and insert "colleges for the benefit of agricultural and the mechanic arts now established or hereafter to be established."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from South Carolina will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 21, strike out "Territorial university or other like Territorial institution" and insert "colleges for the benefit of agricultural and the mechanic arts now established or hereafter to be established."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina whether or not the effect of this will not be to apply it to agricultural colleges if there are such established under the law of 1862?

Mr. TILLMAN. It does. That is specifically provided for in the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. That is provided for in the first section.

Mr. TILLMAN. I know, and this proviso here contradicts the following language below, and it confuses the disposition of this money. This amendment is simply to clarify and specify that the Government donation shall go to the same college, unless there is a separate school of mines in the State.

Mr. ALLISON. I am not speaking of the amendment. I only call attention to the fact that I think it will enlarge the scope of the first section.

Mr. TILLMAN. No, sir; it is in order to make it absolutely clear and certain that the first section is to govern, rather than to confuse it.

Mr. HOAR. I ask that the amendment may be again stated.

The Secretary again stated the amendment previously adopted.

Mr. TILLMAN. On page 3, section 3, lines 1, 2, and 3, I move to strike out everything after the word "made," in line 1, and insert "shall be paid in the manner hereinafter specified to the duly authorized treasurer of such school of mines."

Mr. ALLISON. School of mines or agricultural college?

Mr. TILLMAN. It provides that in States where they have already established schools of mines separate and independent the money shall go to the school of mines rather than to have two schools of mines in one State, in order to build up a strong institution rather than to have two weak ones. That is the purpose.

Mr. BACON. I understand that in States where there are no separate schools of mines the sum will be paid to the agricultural college.

Mr. TILLMAN. It goes to that college which receives the donation from the Government, and wherever the Morrill and Hatch fund goes this fund goes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from South Carolina restate his amendment?

Mr. TILLMAN. I move to strike out, in line 1, page 3, the words "may be assigned by the legislature to such school, if it shall so deem advisable" and insert "shall be paid in the manner hereinafter specified to the duly authorized treasurer of such school of mines."

Mr. BACON. I should like to ask the Senator, in the case I have suggested, where there is no school of mines, if that particular provision ought not to go further and specify that it shall be paid to the treasurer of the agricultural college?

Mr. TILLMAN. It does, if the Senator will examine the bill. These amendments apply to those States which have schools of mines. The general provision provides where the money is to go.

Mr. BACON. The general provision?

Mr. TILLMAN. Of the bill. We are dealing with the exceptions to the bill.

Mr. BACON. The Senator will excuse me for the inquiry. The general provision of the bill, as I understand, requires this money to be paid to the treasurer of the agricultural college in the States where there is not already a school of mines?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from South Carolina will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, section 3, line 1, after the word "made," it is proposed to strike out "may be assigned by the legislature to such school if it shall so deem advisable" and insert in lieu thereof "shall be paid in the manner hereinafter specified to the duly authorized treasurer of such school of mines."

Mr. HOAR. I should like to inquire of the Senator if the amendment which he now proposes, whatever the bill contains, is not the first departure from the policy of paying over the money to the two schools originally recognized by the Morrill bill in 1862? I think it was.

Mr. TILLMAN. I presume it is, and it is in accordance with that very elasticity which the Senator from Massachusetts declared a few minutes ago was so desirable, because certain States whose industries are mainly mineral have provided already for schools of mines and have appropriated money out of their own funds to sustain them.

Mr. HOAR. Then the mining school is to have an advantage which the school for manufacture or mechanic arts is not to have; and that brings me back to what I said a little while ago.

Now, I wonder how Colorado or Nevada would like it, instead of having this bill as it is, you should say that the money is to be distributed to schools to fit men for the business of cotton or woolen manufacturing or for working in shops for the building of cotton or woolen machinery or the manufacture of hard wire, with which Connecticut is full. In Massachusetts, as I said, we have important industries in which the people are engaged. They require applied science, the laws of the transmission of forces, chemistry, free-hand drawing. You would not call that an applied science, but all those things are needed, not merely for the men who are to become the head of such establishments, but for men who are to be skilled workmen and laborers at the bench or in a dye house or wherever; and there is nothing providing for that in this bill or in the old law. But you provided for agriculture. There is nothing provided for these particular things. You provided in the first place for agriculture. You are now providing for mining, and it seems to me it would be desirable—

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. HOAR. Let me finish my sentence. It seems to me it would be desirable if the authority were given particular States or the trustees of the college or the school which is the beneficiary, if they think it is for their advantage to have this sum apportioned to any particular pursuit, so to bestow it. But, as I said, I will not interfere with the Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. I sympathize with the feeling of the Senator from Massachusetts that there should be some elasticity, so as to let the efforts of the individual State be in the line of its peculiar development and interests; and if the Senator can frame an amendment that will not conflict with—and in a measure nullify the purpose and may bring in antagonism—the different sections of the bill, I shall be very glad to accommodate him.

Mr. HOAR. I should be glad to have the Senator's amendment, if he will pardon me for one moment, go at least so far as this. It will not meet my suggestion, but if the Senator proposes that there is a school of mines in the State, this money shall go to that rather than to the old-established technical school which has been existing ever since the Morrill law was enacted. Now, suppose there is a poor, badly equipped school of mines in some corner of the State of Connecticut. It would not be likely to happen in such a State, but it might happen in a State. There is the Sheffield Scientific School, one of the great schools of mining, doing its mining work better than this inferior one. The Senator makes it by his amendment imperative that this money shall go to the school of mines, although the legislature of Connecticut might very much prefer to have it go to the Sheffield school.

Mr. STEWART. That ought to be carefully considered, and if

any of the States desire a different disposition of the money, the amendment will go through nem. con. If the legislature shall ask for it, there will be no objection.

Mr. HOAR. Why not say that the legislature in its discretion may appropriate it to such school of mines?

Mr. TILLMAN. I am perfectly willing to accept such an amendment.

The committee discussed all these phases of the subject, and there were members of the committee, or one member, at least, who was very solicitous that the donation should be left absolutely in the discretion of the legislature, to go to whatever school or whatever purpose it wanted; and our purpose, as we felt we were constrained under the general policy of endowing the already established land-grant colleges, was, as far as practicable, to see that this money went to those schools and no others. The only exceptions we made were in those States where the mining industries had been of such importance that the legislature thereof had appropriated money and established distinct and independent schools of mines.

Mr. HOAR. Now you compel the money to go to the mining schools and not to the old Morrill schools.

Mr. TILLMAN. Only in the States that have such schools.

Mr. HOAR. I understand.

Mr. TILLMAN. And the purpose, the Senator can readily see, is to prevent the frittering away or the wasting of this donation.

Mr. STEWART. There is already a successful school of agriculture in your State. Under this bill it will go to that.

Mr. HOAR. No; because there is a mining school there.

Mr. STEWART. No; it goes to that.

Mr. HOAR. If there should be in Massachusetts within the next two weeks, as I understand the Senator's amendment, a school of mines established, which might not have an endowment of more than \$50,000, this donation has to go to it absolutely without anybody's discretion, to the exclusion of the Massachusetts Agricultural College or the Boston Technology Institute, with very much better provision for instruction in mining than the new school would have.

Mr. STEWART. I do not understand that to be the situation.

Mr. HOAR. That is the way I understand the amendment.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to inquire whether this donation or appropriation is confined to State institutions and does not apply to institutions of a private character?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes; absolutely.

Mr. HOAR. State institutions; institutions established by the State.

Mr. TELLER. There are only a few States which have mining schools, as I think the Senator will find.

Mr. HOAR. That is what I understand.

Mr. TELLER. And if they have not any mining schools, the appropriation goes to the agricultural schools.

Mr. HOAR. The bill will be left as amended—I do not know but that the original bill is the same—as an absolute enactment that if there be a school of mines in a State, established by the legislature, then it will be paid to that school, even if one of the old Morrill schools is in reality very much better prepared and equipped to instruct in mining.

Mr. TELLER. So far as I know mining schools, and I have some knowledge of them, I do not think they will come into competition with the Morrill schools. The States that have established mining schools have established them for mining instruction. They are schools of technology. They are scientific schools. Colorado has one, and some of the other States have. Michigan has one. There are others. They are very valuable schools. Certainly no harm will be done if the money goes to those schools.

Mr. STEWART. It is in the discretion of the legislature.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from South Carolina will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, section 3, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "may be assigned by the legislature to such school if it shall so deem advisable" and insert in lieu thereof "shall be paid in the manner hereinafter specified to the duly authorized treasurer of such school of mines."

Mr. TILLMAN. In accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts, I move to insert "unless the legislature thereof shall order otherwise."

Mr. HOAR. Very well.

Mr. STEWART. That ought to be done.

Mr. TELLER. I suggest the words "unless the legislature shall otherwise direct."

Mr. TILLMAN. I am willing to accept anybody's English, if he thinks it is better.

Mr. ALLISON. This, as I understand, is a bill which proposes to appropriate certain moneys arising from the sale of public lands. I think it is pretty well understood that in the very near future no such money will be derived from the sale of public lands. Therefore this is practically an appropriation from the Treasury.

I suggest to the Senator from South Carolina having charge of the bill a modification which will somewhat restrict the amount, but which I think will be sufficiently large to meet every reasonable purpose, especially when these appropriations are to be used in connection with our agricultural colleges. I shall offer an amendment proposing, in line 5, page 2, section 1, to strike out "ten" and insert "five," and in line 7 to strike out "twenty" and insert "fifteen."

Mr. TILLMAN. I will mention for the benefit of the Senator from Iowa, before his amendment is acted on in the Senate, that in 1899 the net proceeds of the sale of public lands after deducting all expenses incident to the disposal of them was \$1,933,000. Of that amount \$1,108,000 was appropriated in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 30, 1890.

So there are practically \$800,000 in the Treasury now from the proceeds of the public lands last year, and the question as to where this money is to come from I do not think cuts as much figure as the question whether the amount which he proposes is enough or the amount proposed in the bill is too large. I am sure the Senator would not become economical to the extent of saving only \$200,000 unless he felt that it was absolutely a waste to allow more; but if he thinks that \$15,000 instead of \$30,000, the amount proposed, is all that one of these schools of mines will require for apparatus and appliances for metallurgical research and everything of that sort, I shall not antagonize it, but will let the Senate dispose of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to know whether the present amendment is an amendment to the amendment which was proposed by the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. TILLMAN. No, sir; it is an amendment independently proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. I understood the Senator from South Carolina to have secured the adoption of his amendment.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, if he thinks that \$15,000 is enough.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina as modified.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, section 3, line 1, after the word "made," strike out:

may be assigned by the legislature to such school if it shall so deem advisable.

And insert in lieu thereof:

shall be paid in the manner hereinafter specified to the duly authorized treasurer of such school of mines, unless the legislature shall otherwise direct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. In section 1, page 2, line 5, before the word "years," I move to strike out "ten" and insert "five;" and in line 7, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty" and insert "fifteen." I understand the Senator from South Carolina to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa proposes an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 1, page 2, line 5, before the word "years," strike out "ten" and insert "five;" and in line 7, before the word "thousand," strike out "twenty" and insert "fifteen;" so as to read:

And an annual increase of the amount of such appropriation thereafter for five years by an additional sum of \$1,000 over the preceding, and the annual amount to be paid thereafter to each State and Territory shall be \$15,000.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to ask the Senator what is his purpose in reducing it to five years?

Mr. ALLISON. The appropriation now by this bill is \$10,000 per annum for each State and Territory for ten years. That is, \$500,000 a year for ten years.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator is mistaken. I will state it for him. The appropriation is \$10,000 the first year and an increase of \$1,000 a year for ten years, which will make it \$20,000 ultimately. You propose to make it five years, beginning with \$10,000 and going for five years, ending at \$15,000.

Mr. ALLISON. If I had had a little opportunity, I would have stated my position and understanding of the bill. It is that for the first year there is an appropriation of \$500,000 under the bill, and an increase practically of \$50,000 per annum for each year for ten years. My amendment will make that increase of \$50,000 per annum over and above the \$500,000 for the first year continuous for five years only, and after that time the appropriation shall be \$15,000 per annum for one college and school in every State and Territory of the Union.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will accept the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator from South Carolina allow me to ask him a question? Would the bill apply to the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. TILLMAN. They are not Territories yet.

Mr. DANIEL. They have large territory there applied solely to their use. I do not see why it should apply to Hawaii.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator wishes to put in a proviso making an exception as to Hawaii, I am willing to do that. They, of course, get the benefit of all their own public lands and they go to their own uses. I do not see why we should be taxed here to send money there to educate them.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to hear the Senator's views on Porto Rico.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, we are now trespassing on the good nature and patience of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. DANIEL. I was not aware of it.

Mr. TILLMAN. As Senators know, there were to be eulogies beginning at 3 o'clock, and he has kindly consented to allow the bill to be perfected and passed. If the Senator wants to put in Porto Rico, I do not know how you are to get it in.

Mr. DANIEL. I want to know whether it is in or not?

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator knows what my opinion is, but a majority of the Senate decided otherwise and declared that it was not; and I suppose until the Supreme Court determines that question we shall have to abide by the majority rule.

Mr. DANIEL. I move to except Hawaii. I do not know exactly—

Mr. TILLMAN. If we get them in, I think we shall have to treat them all alike; but the question of excepting Hawaii simply is based on the ground that the public lands are her own exclusive property and were donated by the act we passed the other day for her own use. I do not see why we should include her in this beneficence. I am willing to accept an amendment excepting Hawaii.

Mr. DANIEL. I shall move to except Hawaii. After the words "United States," line 19, page 2, I move to insert the words "except Hawaii and Porto Rico."

Mr. MORGAN. I move to amend the amendment by excepting the State of Texas, which also has control of her own lands. Then we will add onto that all the States of the Union that have control of their own lands, and there is a great number of them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia proposes an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 19, after the words "United States," insert the following:

Excepting Hawaii and Porto Rico.

Mr. MORGAN. I move to amend the amendment by adding "Texas."

Mr. BERRY. I hope that amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. TILLMAN. There is no Senator from Texas present, and I trust the Senator from Alabama will not bring up an argument on that question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MORGAN. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. TELLER. I hope the Senator from Alabama will not insist on the yeas and nays.

Mr. STEWART. There will not be a voting quorum. I hope he will not do that.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Shall the bill be ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and read the third time?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, it is very ungracious, I suppose, to offer any suggestion by way of delaying the passage of a bill which on the face of it relates to Government appropriations for education. But I have been utterly unable to understand this bill with all the amendments that have been made here, and it does seem to me that the bill ought to be printed as amended, that we may know what we are passing. Perhaps other Senators have been more fortunate than myself and know precisely what we are passing.

I would also like to have it explained as to whether this money which we appropriate here—\$500,000 the first year—to support schools of mines in the United States is really to come from the proceeds of the sale of public lands, or whether it is to be paid from the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. TILLMAN. The bill itself expressly declares that it is to come from the proceeds of the sale of public lands, and the last section provides that there is no contract or implied obligation on the part of the United States to continue these appropriations any longer than it sees proper.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I know that, Mr. President; and

I know, too, that the Senator from Iowa said that this was, he thought, practically an appropriation from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. ALLISON. It is an appropriation directly in the bill, to be reimbursed, of course.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. We have before us a bill which I suppose will be passed in the Senate, though I am not in favor of it (it has been passed by the House), which provides that in case the sales from public lands shall not be sufficient to meet the appropriations for the agricultural colleges the deficiency shall be made up out of the Treasury of the United States.

I suppose it is well understood that the sales of public lands are not bringing in any excess of money now for the support of the agricultural colleges, and that in a very few years, perhaps within the next year, or the year after, there will not be sufficient money from the sale of public lands to meet the appropriations for the agricultural colleges and the deficiency will have to be made up out of the Treasury of the United States. So, whatever may be the letter of this bill, it is perfectly apparent that these appropriations for the schools of mines, amounting to \$500,000 the first year and running up to \$750,000 at the end of five years, will be paid from the United States Treasury, and the Treasury will not be reimbursed from the sales of public lands.

Now, Mr. President, as I said, it is ungracious to make any suggestions, I suppose, about a bill that contemplates an expenditure for education.

Mr. CAFFERY. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question? Does the bill provide for the payment of this annual sum out of the Treasury in case there is a deficiency of funds arising from the proceeds of the sale of public lands?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not say that this bill does, but I say that we have a bill before us which has been passed by the House and which proposes to meet the appropriation for the agricultural colleges by supplying the deficiency from the United States Treasury, upon the theory that the amount derived from the sales of public lands is not going to be sufficient to meet that appropriation.

Mr. CAFFERY. If that theory be correct—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I believe that is true.

Mr. CAFFERY. If that be true, where will the funds come from, then, to donate to these mining schools?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. They either will not be paid at all or the Senators who are in favor of this bill will come in at another session and ask to have them paid out of the Treasury of the United States, and we all know that that will be done.

Mr. HOAR. A large portion of this is to go to agricultural colleges, and only in a few excepted instances does it go to separate mining schools, under a general clause of the bill.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. That is true. That, then, will simply be in addition to the amount which is now paid to agricultural colleges. If the money goes to the agricultural colleges and not to schools of mines, it simply increases, as I understand it, the appropriation for the agricultural colleges in those instances.

Now, Mr. President, I think it may well be a question whether we should not pause for a moment and see whether the people of the United States should be taxed to support schools of mines in certain States where those schools are desired and where they will be supported greatly for the benefit of the States and the people of the States undoubtedly. For my part, I hesitate very much about this proposed bill.

I ask that the bill be printed with the amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill, with the amendments, will be printed.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE BAIRD.

Mr. MCENERY. Mr. President, I ask that the resolutions from the House of Representatives on the death of the late Representative BAIRD may now be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, January 27, 1900.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. SAMUEL T. BAIRD, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for fitting tributes to his memory.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy of the same to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as an additional mark of respect the House, at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings, do adjourn.

Mr. MCENERY. Mr. President, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk, and I ask for their present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. SAMUEL T. BAIRD, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the business of the Senate be now suspended, in order that fitting tribute may be paid to his memory.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted by the Secretary to the family of the deceased; and that, as a further mark of respect, the Senate will, at the conclusion of these ceremonies, stand adjourned.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, Mr. BAIRD was from the extreme northern and I am from the extreme southern portion of Louisiana. I did not become acquainted with him until we met here; he as a Representative of the Fifth Congressional district of our State and I as a Senator from the same State.

Our official intercourse, as well as our personal, was slight and occasional, and consequently I was not close to him as a bosom friend.

But he impressed me, as he did everyone who came in contact with him, with the broad outlines and qualities of a high character, distinguished by candor, ability, and integrity.

His presence was commanding, his manners engaging, his conversation fluent and full of information, and his whole bearing that of an accomplished gentleman. But, Mr. President, I learned more of Mr. BAIRD at his burial than during his life.

There I saw his neighbors and friends gathered from every portion of his district to honor his memory and to consign his remains to the earth.

There the old and young, the rich and poor, bent with touching grief over his grave, and each brought to it tributes of love and respect.

There the ancient fraternity of the Freemasons joined in sorrowful rivalry with the church of God to honor the dead and to assuage the grief of his afflicted family by all that fellowship on earth can give, and by all that the promises of religion can yield.

It was my good fortune to be one of the committee that escorted his remains from Washington, where he died, to his home in Bastrop, La., where he was buried.

And never did I see a more genuine expression of love and respect than was exhibited on the occasion of his funeral ceremonies, that I witnessed at Bastrop. Every road that led to the little city brought in friends and constituents to do him the last earthly honor. Every eye was moistened with tears at his untimely demise, and every heart was grieved at the great loss to his family, his friends, and his country. He was stricken down in the prime and vigor of his manhood, for he was only 38 years of age when he died, and the potent forces alive and active in him to bring forth fruit of distinction and usefulness were stilled forever by the ruthless hand of death.

It was sad to see his young, manly form consigned to the dust from which he sprung; it was sad to know that his career of usefulness and honor was suddenly cut off; but it was infinitely sadder to witness the heart-crushing grief of the woman who had joined her life to his for weal and for woe and to witness the hopeless sorrow of the child of their marriage, so tender in years, but yet made acquainted with heaviest of sorrows so early in life.

He who commanded us to visit the widow and the orphan in their distress will surely not withhold the balm of Gilead from the wounded hearts of mother and child, nor will He fail to temper the winds to these shorn lambs of suffering humanity.

The life history of SAMUEL BAIRD will no doubt be given by my colleague. He is from the same section of country as Mr. BAIRD, and I leave this pleasing task to him.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the associate and friend whose life and deeds we to-day commemorate was born and lived in that fascinating and romantic region of the United States known as Louisiana. My personal knowledge of that State has been limited, but interesting. In the spring of 1855, in my twentieth year, I went from the law school at Cambridge to New Orleans in a sailing ship, the *Trimountain*, from Boston. We lay upon the shallows of the delta of the Mississippi for several days before ascending to that unique and attractive city. Meeting at the St. Charles Hotel Henry W. Allen, whom I had known at the law school, he asked me to come with him to his sugar plantation at West Baton Rouge, and there I spent two delightful weeks, returning home by land. All then was prosperity in Louisiana. The levees of New Orleans were lined with steamers loaded with cotton and with the gorgeous floating passenger palaces of those days. The surrounding country was a scene of marvelous beauty, the summer was opening, the cotton plants were shooting upward, magnificent roses were beginning to bloom, and the fragrance of the buds and flowers and the morning music of the birds and all the other wondrous manifestations of bounteous nature, combining with the lavish hospitality of Mr. Allen and his neighboring planters, made my visit to West Baton Rouge most entrancing to me, and aroused sentiments of friendship for those joyous companions of my youth which have never lost their controlling power.

Eleven years later, in 1866, I went again to Louisiana, sent by President Johnson and Secretary McCulloch, in company with a most delightful associate, the Hon. Harvey Watterson, father of the gifted and eloquent editor and orator, Mr. Henry Watterson. Then all had changed for the worse. New Orleans showed great activity on account of special business connected with the civil

war, but the city was without substantial prosperity, while out on the river shores the sugar plantations were uncultivated, the machinery going to ruin, and the buildings falling to pieces. This was indeed a sad contrast to the sights and incidents of 1855, but fortunately was soon to be changed for the better.

The recovery, as peace came on, from the ruin and devastation of war was rapid, and to-day, a third of a century later, Louisiana is once more one of the most prosperous of the States of the Union. New Orleans is a vast and wealthy metropolis, while the whole surface of the State, not, to be sure, varied by high mountain and deep valley, but with its own peculiar beauty, is one broad garden spot, with crops of cotton and sugar abundant and with its sugarhouses rebuilt and provided with new and modern machinery of wonderful capacity. The productive fields are blooming and blossoming like rose gardens in extreme loveliness, giving delight to all who are permitted to look upon so fair a land.

Henry W. Allen, of whom I have spoken as my host in 1855, afterwards became the Confederate governor of Louisiana. He fought with extreme gallantry and to the last ditch, and then escaped through Texas and Mexico to Nassau. It was with quick zeal and revived affection that I obtained from President Johnson early in 1865 permission for Governor Allen to return to the United States in hopes to die upon his native soil. Unfortunately he passed away upon his homeward voyage; a brave and manly soul.

Amid the delightful inspirations which come from the joyous springtime in Louisiana was born, on May 5, 1861, and nurtured at Oak Ridge, our friend SAMUEL T. BAIRD. His home life was fortunate; his education was ample, and at the early age of 21 he was admitted to the bar. Until he became a member of Congress he was a practicing attorney, part of the time one of the district attorneys of the State and also a district judge for four years.

The political career on which he shortly entered was creditable to him and full of high promise for the future. He rose rapidly in the estimation of those with whom he came in contact, and in 1896 was elected to Congress to begin a life of useful and patriotic service, which was most unfortunately ended prematurely by his death in Washington on April 23, 1899. Mr. BAIRD was a courteous gentleman of attractive manners, a well-equipped lawyer of more than ordinary attainments, and a Congressman of superior capacity and unimpeachable integrity; an American citizen so loved and honored that his death in the prime of life was a most grievous bereavement, indeed hard for his family and friends and his State and country to sadly meet and to patiently endure. His name should be enrolled by Louisiana among her dearest and noblest sons, and we here to-day, his official associates, should willingly pay such tributes to his memory that the young men of his State shall be animated by our words of admiration to persist in exertions to imitate his virtues and to follow in his footsteps in private and in public life.

In mourning now for him who has joined the other loved ones who are for a time lost to us in the mysterious abodes beyond our mortal sight we must not grieve as those who are without hope. Certainly we should not be anxious about him who has passed through the covered bridge that crosses the dark river which separates this world from the heavenly country. To us there may have come a heavy loss, but to him we reverently believe there has come an inestimable gain. As one grows older he necessarily comes to feel how little after all is the value of life to one while he is living it.

The pleasures of living, the transitory joys of existence, thrilling and intense as they sometimes seem, are of no permanent value. The true worth of life surely is only to be found in the opportunity it gives for the formation of character. That, under God, is its sole purpose. Everything but character we leave behind us when this mortal state is ended. The character which is formed within us by the experiences of our earthly existence, whether brief or long, makes us what we are and all we are, and that alone goes on with us to the life beyond. The greatest thing in the world, therefore, is the formation of good and noble character; to be such a result and acquisition as to make life worth living, because it makes desirable that immortality which is the inalienable and indestructible birthright of every human soul.

If such is our philosophy and our religion, we shall not think that because our friend's life was so short it was at all in vain. He lived long enough to form a noble character, fitting him for better than earthly service; and we must put aside sorrow and all misgivings and imagine him doing the Master's work in a happier sphere, with clearer vision, with higher freedom, with purer affections, and with fruition of heavenly completeness. So we may well say:

Go to thy grave, in all thy glorious prime,
In full activity of zeal and power.

Go to thy grave? No, take thy seat above,
Be thy pure spirit present with the Lord,
Where thou for faith and hope hath perfect love
And open vision for the written word.

On the 27th day of January the House of Representatives paid

tribute to the memory of Mr. BAIRD. Those members who had known him best in that, his last place of service—comrades from other States and colleagues from his own State—delivered appropriate eulogies in praise of the brother who had forever left their ranks. In reading their affectionate expressions I am impressed not only with their eloquence, but also with their clear sincerity. The Louisiana members knew him best and loved him most and spoke words of truth and soberness in their characterizations of their friend. Mr. President, his life was worth living, if only to result in invoking from those who lived with him, and labored by his side, and penetrated with keen insight into his inner thoughts and life such a high opinion, such a favorable judgment, and such a tender affection as they unitedly declare.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, Mr. BAIRD represented a district in Louisiana immediately south of and adjoining the State of Arkansas, in which I live. I had learned of his life and character before he came to Congress, and knew how faithfully and well he had served his people as district attorney, as judge of a court, and as senator in the legislature of Louisiana.

During the first winter of his service here I lived in the same hotel with him and his family. He was then little more than 35 years of age; he was in splendid health and a remarkably handsome man. He came to his duties here full of life and of hope. He was bright, genial, and especially kind to all with whom he came in contact; proud of his success, yet not spoiled by it; ambitious to do something for the people who had honored him; devoted to his wife and to his boys. I think I have never seen anyone to whom life seemed more pleasant and the future more hopeful.

He served a term in Congress, making many friends in the House and in the Senate, thereby laying the foundation for future usefulness to his people. He was reelected to Congress, but soon after the beginning of his second term disease came, and death soon followed. He fell at a time when life promised most. He died before age, disease, misfortune, and disappointment had weakened his faith in his fellow-men. He died while life was still a hope and not a burden; and who can say it was not best so?

We may ask why one so young, so gifted, whose life promised so much, should be thus early taken away; we may ask why such pain and grief and sorrow should come to the devoted wife, and why his beloved boys should be left without a father's guiding hand. The only answer is that the Great Ruler of all, who doeth all things well, willed that it should be so.

His body was taken from this city to his home at Bastrop, in Louisiana, and there, surrounded by many hundreds of those who had known him as a child, as a boy, and as a man, by those who had watched his career and had always been glad to honor him, he was laid to rest. He sleeps beneath the magnolias of his beloved State, in that beautiful Southern land where the flowers seldom cease to bloom.

While his name may soon be forgotten here, his memory will long be cherished by the wife who was devoted to him, by the friends who had known and honored him in his childhood, his boyhood, and his manhood; who knew him best and loved him most.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, the hand upon the dial of life stands still. The silver chord of life is loosened; the soul of our deceased friend has passed from its frail tenement of clay to the realms of eternal day.

No truer, better, or nobler man ever passed from the hearthstone of his home and out of the life of a devoted wife and the guardianship of his family than he.

SAMUEL T. BAIRD, of Morehouse Parish, La., whose untimely death we deplore, and to whose worth and many manly virtues I to-day would pay most willing tribute, has passed through the unseen portals to the unknown world that awaits us all so soon.

It seems almost incredible to think that one so young, so strong, so full of all the manly qualities, should so suddenly have been removed from our midst, showing how utterly helpless and dependent we are, ever, for a day of our lives upon the Divine will.

He was reared and educated amid the tropical plants and trees and flowers of the beautiful State of Louisiana, where the soft winds from the Mexican Gulf lulled to rest his infant hours and tempered his maturer years in harmony with the sweet environments that linger there. Since his death, and as I express these thoughts, the picture comes to me of the fertile soil, the resplendent flowers, and the sweeping gray moss like a bridal veil that greets the eye on every side in that fair land of dark-eyed maidens and splendid cavaliers.

He was loyal to his friends, fair to his opponents, and self-sacrificing for his people and the State that gave him birth.

He was honored among men; beginning the sterner duties of life at 23 years of age. He held the important position of district attorney of his State, a position which has in its peculiar keeping the highest interests of society. It is the one office that is the foundation stone of social order in every State. He discharged the

duties of this position for four years with such eminent satisfaction that his people called him to the bench as their judge, to preside over one of the largest and most important districts in his State. With signal ability and distinguished honor he discharged every duty incumbent there, and when he determined to return to the private walks of life, the people he had known from earliest boyhood placed him again in public life, sending him to the State senate, and later still sending him to the Fifty-fifth Congress as their Representative; and again, as the reward of merit and a token of their regard and esteem, he was elected to the Fifty-sixth Congress by those who knew him best and loved him most.

It is a significant fact that in all his public career he never met with a single defeat. The people, upon whose broad shoulders many burdens are borne, were always with him and appreciated his genius, his integrity, and his splendid manhood. Death claimed him ere he had reached upon life's highway the point where morning touches noon and while the shadows still were falling to the west.

I can hardly realize that he is gone. I bade him farewell the evening before leaving for my home, and he chatted long with me as to the coming session and the great issues that would come before Congress for action, the settlement of which would fix the destiny of millions of human beings and give new strength to the Constitution or implant the seeds of national decay and death.

Modest, dignified, genial, true, and courageous, his record and life were as spotless as the soul that he gave back to his God on the 23d of April one year ago.

It is well that we pause on occasions like this and review our life's work, meditate upon the accomplishments and weigh them, determining whether life has been a genuine success or a failure; whether the world has been better for our having lived in it; whether the footprints left behind us are always found along the paths of honor, leading upward to the highest life, or whether, to catch for a brief moment the applause of an unthinking and fickle public, our paths have not often led along doubtful and dangerous lines.

Let us pause and reflect, and in the shadow of this great sorrow renew within our secret hearts the pledge to so live and discharge our duty to our fellow-man that when the final hour comes we may rest assured that there is a light in the mansion not builded with hands, eternal in the heavens, that shall illumine our lives in the realm of unchanging eternity.

The life of the distinguished dead was an honor to his ancestry; it justified and fulfilled the hopes of his friends and adorned the State he lived in; it was at once brilliant, brave, and true; a poem in life, in death a sacred memory to those whom he leaves to mourn his departure.

His death reminds us that—

The rainbow brightens but to melt away,
And the sweet sounds that wander in the air
But swell the dirge of sorrow and decay.

Mr. MCENERY. Mr. President, it is always with regret that we learn of the death of the aged and infirm. We recognize the fact that the family is in sorrow, hearts stricken with grief, children orphaned, and the home circle severed and broken. But there are occasions when the life of our fellow-man becomes extinct that the sad affliction to home and family becomes more keen by exceptional circumstances which attended the deceased in his last moments.

It is sad and mournful enough to be taken away in the prime of young manhood, when the intellect is just reaching full maturity, when the soul is expanding in love for humanity and life becoming joyous in the ripening of the faculties to enjoy the full measure of love, of ambition, and of usefulness.

There was in the illness of SAMUEL T. BAIRD that which strongly appeals to our sympathy and quickens the heart beat in response to the orphan's cry and the widow's tears.

In the prime of manhood, in the full possession of a powerful and vigorous body, of a strong mind, well furnished and equipped for conflict with the world in attaining that worthy ambition which was the inspiration of his life—greatness in his profession and the first in distinction among his fellow-citizens—he was stricken suddenly with a fatal and painful disease. That magnificent specimen of manhood which was the envy of the athlete; that face which bore upon it the impress of beauty; that smile which broke into kindness, love, and gentleness; that eye which beamed with intelligence and invited to close communion and friendship; that form which moved with grace and elegance and dignity—all were distorted by pain and agony, unrelenting and unceasing, for weeks, until death, kind in its visitation, ended his agony and closed his brilliant career forever. But his masterful intellect amid the wreck and ruin of his frame remained unimpaired. His consciousness, his strong reasoning power, remained until the last scene of his struggle.

No complaint of suffering escaped him; his kind and gentle disposition, the impulses of a noble nature and a generous heart rose above his condition. Death he knew was near, yet he gave no

evidence of alarm at facing the unknown world. On its threshold, with the clouds fast gathering about him, he was cheerful, he was kind, he was gentle, he was the impersonation of all that is good, loving, and great. Messages in a sweet, melodious voice were addressed to his friends; consolation, love, and advice to his devoted wife and children—all the world, wife, children, father, relatives, friends, strangers, were within the reach of his last farewell. Had he had an enemy he would have been embraced with forgiveness; but he had no enemy. No man's heart, however blackened with envy, could find fault with him. He was beyond reproach in character and beyond criticism as an official. In all the relations of life—domestic, social, judicial, and political—his conduct was such as to be beyond the suspicion of the most exacting.

There are many obstacles which may stand between a man and his ambition. When the young are taken away we can only conjecture as to the possibilities of their future. But SAMUEL T. BAIRD, so far as he progressed, had attained by honorable methods in the assertion of a vigorous manhood all that he had wished. It is but a logical conclusion to say in the fuller growth of his manhood he would have attained greater distinction in his State and a higher station in the nation.

"SAMUEL T. BAIRD, of Bastrop, was born May 5, 1861, at Oak Ridge, La.; was educated at home and at Vincennes, Ind.; began the study of law in 1879, and was admitted to the bar in 1882; was elected district attorney of the sixth judicial district in 1884; served four years in that position, and was elected district judge of the same district in 1888; after serving four years upon the bench, resumed practice of law; was elected to the State senate in April, 1896, and served as chairman of the committee on railroads and as a member of judiciary, lands, and levees, and election committees; was chairman of joint Democratic caucus during session of general assembly; was temporary chairman of Democratic State convention in June, 1896; was a delegate to the national Democratic convention in Chicago, 1896, and was elected to the Fifty-fifth Congress as a Democrat, receiving 11,494 votes, against 4,870 votes for A. Benoit, Populist."

It will be observed from the above sketch that all the public positions which he held were at an early age, at a time when men are usually preparing for the discharge of the duties imposed by them. He ranked well as a lawyer soon after his admission to the bar. As district attorney he was able and conscientious and discharged the duties of the office to the satisfaction of bar, bench, and the people. He carried to the duties of the bench the qualities which make a good judge—high character, integrity, industry, and a knowledge of the law. He was the youngest in the State of Louisiana, and ranked among the best of district judges. His investigation of cases was exhaustive and he had the tact of marshaling the facts in a clear and concise statement and the ability of applying the law with almost unerring judgment.

As a member of the State senate, he was an honored and valued member and brought to the discharge of his duties a thorough knowledge of the wants and conditions of the State. He was an able assistant in framing good laws, and an earnest opponent of doubtful legislation. He served one term in Congress. His course in the House of Representatives was acceptable to his people, who approved it and reelected him to a second term, a member of the Fifty-sixth Congress. His colleagues in the House of Representatives have given testimony of his character and ability. I think I can safely assert that every member of Congress who came in contact with him recognized his ability, his graceful deportment, and the elegance of his manners.

He was well known and highly respected in Louisiana. There were expressions of sorrow everywhere when his untimely death was announced, and it was a universal conviction among the people that the State of Louisiana had lost one of her worthiest sons.

He had identified himself with every movement to advance the material, social, and political interests of the State. He was a moving spirit and directing force in one of the important crises in the history of the State. He held strong convictions, and he had the courage to assert and maintain them. He was true to every cause he espoused; faithful to friends and generous to opponents. There was for him no temporary expedient, no compromise of what he thought was right, no yielding of principle, but with force and energy was its positive assertion manifested in dignified and honorable action.

I knew SAMUEL T. BAIRD from his earliest youth. I loved his bright, sunny smile, the joyousness of a heart that went out and gathered all that is worthy in life and incorporated it as a part of himself. I noticed with interest, with more than a passing interest, his rapid advancement in his profession, his success in political life, and, more than all, the happiness with which he had surrounded himself in the charms of a cultured and brilliant wife, in the innocence of young and promising children. How pleasant it is for the aged to follow the footsteps of youth, to hear in the advancing steps the cry of triumph as it reaches out to grasp the

object of its pursuit. How more intense is this interest when a deep affection guides the eye, and the ear is strained to listen and catch the shouts of victory. But, oh, how sad, when the last shout of victory is heard, that it should mingle with the sad and solemn sounds as the clods of earth are thrown upon him to bury youth, and beauty, and joy, and ambition, and that love and that affection which watched the steps until they ceased at the grave. And it was thus with SAMUEL T. BAIRD.

The cry of victory was still ringing in the ears of his devoted constituents and admirers when they, a multitude, were called to the last resting place for him to hear the dull sound as it rose from the grave and proclaimed how empty are all the honors of earth. With that multitude I stood; with that multitude I mourned the loss of so much worth and goodness; but with the abiding faith that he who had been our companion and friend, whose genial nature had gladdened our hours, had gone to the home of the good and the brave as an hostage to draw us nearer to the seat of mercy.

He hath an hostage taken
To lure us to His feet;
We are not all forsaken
Since there we soon shall meet
Him in his youth and beauty,
O, noble, white young soul,
That trod the path of duty
And righteous self-control.

Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the resolutions which have been submitted by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. MCENERY].

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, May 11, 1900, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, May 10, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 6749) for the relief of Mary A. Swift.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2657) to reimburse sundry collectors of internal revenue for internal-revenue stamps paid for and charged in their accounts and not received by them.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution (S. R. 48) authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a pedestal for a bronze statue in Washington, D. C., in honor of the late Henry Wadsworth Longfellow; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 3476) for the relief of Mary A. Swift.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be directed to cause a survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of removing a portion of Hendersons Point, Portsmouth Harbor, New Hampshire, with a view of improving navigation to the navy-yard.

Also:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to make careful examination and prepare a detailed plan and estimate for the improvement of Oakland Harbor, California, to meet the needs of present and prospective commerce from the western end of the tidal canal to deep water in San Francisco Bay, including the excavation of a tidal basin, the report to be submitted to Congress at its next session.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following resolutions were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. R. 48. Joint resolution authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a pedestal for a bronze statue in Washington, D. C., in honor of the late Henry Wadsworth Longfellow—to the Committee on the Library.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 57:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to make careful examination and prepare a detailed plan and estimate for the improvement of Oakland Harbor, California, to meet the needs of present and prospective commerce, from the

western end of the tidal canal to deep water in San Francisco Bay, including the excavation of a tidal basin, the report to be submitted to Congress at its next session—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 56:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be directed to cause a survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of removing a portion of Hendersons Point, Portsmouth Harbor, New Hampshire, with a view of improving navigation to the navy-yard—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 7022. An act granting a pension to Rhoda A. Patman;

H. R. 6784. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Neff;

H. R. 1737. An act granting a pension to Cora I. Cromwell;

H. R. 4276. An act granting an increase of pension to John R. Eggeman;

H. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution providing for the printing and distribution of the general report of the expedition of the steamer *Fishhawk* to Porto Rico, including the chapter relating to the fish and fisheries of Porto Rico as contained in the Fish Commission bulletin for 1900;

H. R. 1381. An act granting an increase of pension to James J. Angel;

H. R. 8079. An act granting a pension to Bertha M. Jordan;

H. R. 4030. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Coleman;

S. 2499. An act to authorize needed repairs of the graveled or macadamized road from the city of Newbern, N. C., to the national cemetery near said city;

S. 1906. An act granting an increase of pension to Agnes K. Capron;

S. 1905. An act granting an increase of pension to Lillian Capron;

S. 2366. An act to authorize the establishment at some point in North Carolina of a station for the investigation of problems connected with marine fishery interests of the Middle and South Atlantic coast;

S. 3537. An act to grant authority to change the name of the steamship *Paris*;

S. 2559. An act authorizing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to redeem or make allowance for internal-revenue stamps;

S. 392. An act to pay the General Marine Insurance Company of Dresden the sum of \$1,434.12 for certain coupons detached from United States bonds, which said coupons were lost on the Cunard steamship *Oregon*, sunk at sea March 14, 1866;

S. 1284. An act for the relief of W. H. L. Pepperell, of Concordia, Kans.;

S. 1356. An act for the relief of Edwin L. Field; and

S. 1894. An act for the relief of the Union Iron Works, of San Francisco, Cal.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present at this time for consideration a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

Mr. HITT. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the original resolution which was referred to the committee be first reported, and then the substitute which the committee recommend.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the original resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution No. 242.

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to furnish to Congress, if not incompatible with the public interests, all the information in the possession of the State Department relating to the immigration of Japanese during the last two years, what the probabilities are, if any, as to such immigration for the ensuing year, and what measures, if any, have been or will be adopted by the State Department to regulate and control such immigration.

Mr. HITT. Now let the substitute be read.

The substitute resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish to the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the public interest, all the information in possession of the Treasury Department in relation to the immigration of Japanese laborers during the last two years, what the probabilities are as to such immigration for the ensuing year, what methods have been taken to enforce the laws excluding contract laborers, and the punishment of those unlawfully making contracts for Japanese laborers.

Mr. HITT. I ask a vote on the substitute.

The substitute was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HITT, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

KATHERINE TAYLOR DODGE.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a privileged matter—a conference report. I ask that the statement of the conferees be read, which explains fully the action taken.

The statement was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on bill S. 2650, "An act granting an increase of pension to Katherine Taylor Dodge," have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by the House insert "thirty."

In line 9, after the word "receive," insert "and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of the said Charles Dodge, Jr., until such child shall arrive at the age of sixteen years;" and the House agree to the same.

H. C. LOUDENSLAGER,
JACOB H. BROMWELL,
S. W. DAVENPORT.

Managers on the part of the House.

The report of the committee of conference was considered, and agreed to.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—PEARSON VS. CRAWFORD.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the contestant, Mr. Pearson, be permitted to address the House in his own behalf, occupying fifty minutes of my time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Do I understand that this time is to be occupied now?

Mr. ROBERTS. Certainly.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. We have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This will come out of the time of the majority, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has no time remaining.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts, and I thank gentlemen on the other side of the House for the opportunity they have given to me to address the House at this time. If, sir, I had the eloquence of Apollo combined with the logic of St. Paul, I could not in the limited time at my disposal condense what I have to say and present a complete argument in this case.

There are three points to which I wish especially to address myself. Any one of these three points being decided by this body in my favor gives me without question the seat for which I am contesting. The first is—and I submit this to the candid judgment of my friend from Indiana [Mr. MIERS]—the first is that every citizen of the United States is entitled to the equal construction of the laws. If this is decided in my favor, it awards me the seat for which I am contending.

The second proposition is this: Where fraud, ballot-box stuffing, and bribery are shown to have been practiced in an election; where a ballot box contains several hundred unknown tickets at the time that the election begins; where there is a direct contradiction of testimony between the Republicans and Democrats as to what those tickets were, as to when they were discovered; and in this confusion an incorrect—I will not call it false—return is made from that box, and when the count is made by an officer who was not a judge or a registrar, and where no one but the judge or registrar had the right to count the tickets; when, in addition to that, bribery is shown to have existed at this precinct; and when, in addition to that, it is shown that there is a very great, abnormal, and suspicious increase in the Democratic majority, the contents of that box should not command the credence and faith that belongs to a valid return, and the parties should be required to prove their votes aliunde.

The third proposition—and I trust I may have the attention of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS]—the third proposition is this: That the contestee should not be allowed to profit by the circulation of false, fraudulent, spurious, and injurious letters with my name attached, which were distributed broadcast in that district on the day of election; which were accompanied by the use of money, by absolute bribery, in several cases admitted by the minority—Democratic money in this hand and a false promise in that hand, ostensibly coming from me with my name forged to the promise—I submit to this honorable body, and I submit to the honorable gentlemen on the other side, that no benefit should accrue from such illegitimate warfare. Those are my three propositions. Decide any of these three in my favor and you award the seat to me.

Mr. Speaker, before elaborating these propositions I may be permitted to say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS] that he has perhaps misunderstood the methods of loyal Republicans when they engage in political combat against a common enemy. It seems that he has assumed sudden and cordial relations with his excellency the governor of North Carolina.

I can not criticize the action of the governor at this time, nor can I be diverted by a thrust in the rear while I am grappling with an enemy in front, but I have this criticism to make of the men who misrepresented the facts to the governor, of the men who misrepresented the facts to the Democratic conventions in

North Carolina in this respect, that they stated that the contestant was endeavoring to throw out the vote of the city of Asheville.

I call upon the chairman who reported this resolution; I call upon my valued friend from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY], and I have a further witness in the person of our distinguished Senator, the Hon. J. C. PRITCHARD—I call upon these gentlemen to bear witness that from the very beginning I have insisted that Asheville should not be thrown out.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. PEARSON. Most certainly.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. If I remember, you made an argument before the committee. Did you take that position at that time?

Mr. PEARSON. I not only took that position at that time, but I have maintained that position ever since. If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] is within the sound of my voice, I want to thank him for what he did here yesterday. He has not changed his opinion as to the law. He has not changed his position as to the facts and the precedents which justify his conclusion, but in deference to the wishes expressed by myself and by my colleagues he has agreed that the vote of the city of Asheville shall not be rejected, because it puts into the mouths of the Democrats the argument that Republicans are no better than they in the matter of disfranchisement.

I challenge you gentlemen here to-day on this proposition. I tell you that the Republican party is the party of enfranchisement. The Democratic party is the party of disfranchisement. And I want my fellow-citizens in North Carolina to know that if the people of that city are disfranchised, as you call it, it is your fault, not mine, nor the fault of this side of the House. Although you howled and complained and protested that this disfranchisement was unjust, you are now maintaining that injustice yourselves, and you alone are responsible.

If it is a crime and a shame to reject and disfranchise the votes of 3,000 people, what will you say about your Goebel law and your Goebel methods in Kentucky, by which you disfranchised 36,000 voters at one fell swoop in the city of Louisville and disfranchised the citizens of 38 counties of that Commonwealth, simply because the paper on which the ballots were printed was, by the estimation of a hair, one thousandth or one millionth part too thin or too light to suit the critical and exacting taste of the State election officers—paper, mark you, furnished by the State itself?

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] undertook yesterday to protest against this proceeding, and he cited the case of Harris against Scarborough. Mr. Speaker, under the decision in Harris against Scarborough, if I may be permitted, with great respect, to address the Chair personally, if D. B. HENDERSON had been a citizen of North Carolina, he would have been disfranchised unless his name had been written out on the registration book DAVID BREMER HENDERSON instead of D. B. HENDERSON; and under that decision, my friends, your party disfranchised 49,000 citizens, lawful voters of the State of North Carolina, black and white.

But more than that. That does not compare with the wholesale disfranchisement of the proposition that you now have before the people of North Carolina, by which—

Mr. KITCHIN. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. PEARSON. Certainly.

Mr. KITCHIN. I just wish to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that I did not cite the case of Harris against Scarborough as an authority in this case. I merely referred to the opinion in Quinn against Lattimore as overruling the case of Harris against Scarborough, which had been done by your Republican court.

Mr. PEARSON. And the gentleman who has just addressed the House had the honor to be born in the old county of Halifax, where the State constitution of North Carolina was formed about a hundred and twenty-four years ago. That county has the largest negro population of any county in the State. This gentleman who is opposed to disfranchisement comes from a county that is the banner Democratic county in the State of North Carolina, with the largest population of negro voters in the State, and yet the banner Democratic county, and it went Democratic last year by 1,500 majority or more, and why?

Mr. KITCHIN. That is not in my district.

Mr. PEARSON. The sands in the glass are running against me. But, my friends, let me read you this, the promise that your party made to the people of North Carolina in the last campaign:

The Constitution gives the right of suffrage to all male persons over 21 years of age not disqualified by crime. The legislature can not take away or add a letter to that. That can only be done by the people, and the Democrats will never submit any proposition to the people to take from a man his right to vote.

Is there a man here who will deny that that promise was made and circulated in the Democratic handbook, which is the Democratic political bible? Is there a man here that will rise in his place and say that that promise was not made? Is there a man

here that will rise in his place and say that that promise was not broken, without explanation, without remorse, without even the excuse of necessity? Here you go and do the very particular, specific thing which you promised not to do, and in doing it disfranchise 140,000 citizens of North Carolina. I trust that the gentleman will no longer talk about disfranchisement.

Mr. Speaker, there is one more thing I desire to say here. In order to save time, and in order that my remarks may be understood more readily, I point to that chart, or that map [pointing], which shows the issue on which this campaign was waged and the result of that issue; and I am here to say to my Republican friends that that issue was false as applied to my district.

It was false as applied to myself. Not only was the issue false, but the combination made to work that issue was false, because you put a bogus man by the name of Boggs on the ticket. To do what? Simply to enable the Democrats to control the machinery; and when you say in your minority report—and I speak deferentially, because I am your guest—when you say the contestant had the majority of the poll holders, it is obliged to be simply ignorance on your part.

Mr. Boggs did run as the Populist candidate. Mr. Boggs only got certain votes in thirty precincts, amounting to 93 all told; but, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Boggs, through section 7 of the election law, had the power to throw into the hands of Mr. Crawford the control of the election boards wherever there were Populists appointed as poll holders.

Mr. Boggs did not get any votes in 192 precincts; not one. Even the men whom he had appointed as his representative and poll holders did not vote for him, showing that that was the combination made. Now, gentlemen—and particularly gentlemen on this side of the House—do you see these two black lines at the top [pointing to chart in front of Reporters' desk]? They show the 2 counties out of the 16 in which my honorable competitor received a majority of 1,027 votes.

The other lines show the 14 counties all told, and put together, with their total vote added, which gave to me a majority of 800 votes. These 2 first counties named contain a majority of all the colored voters of the district. The other 14 contain less than a majority, and the only change made in the district was in these 2 counties containing a majority of the black population of the district. There was no change practically in the other 14 counties. There was a gain for my friend of 1,300 votes in these two counties where there was a majority of the total negro vote, thus showing conclusively the issue and the operating force of the campaign.

My friends, in the name of God and fair play—and the American people like fair play and demand a fair fight—how do you dare to throw upon the Republican party the odium of the negro vote when you walk off all the time with its benefits? It is a mathematical proposition. It is as certain as anything that can be stated that the larger the negro vote in any county, in any district, in any State, the larger the Democratic majority from that county, district, or State.

Gentlemen, I am going to propose, if we can not agree here as to the matter of time in closing this debate, I am going to propose to you that we agree on one proposition, and that is this: Look back at that row of seats [pointing to the Democratic side] where there are about 39 in the block. You gentlemen on that side occupy 39 seats in this House and 39 in the electoral college, due to the negro vote. No, no, you do not count it at the ballot box, but you do count it on the basis of apportionment.

I propose to you to keep what you have, but do not come into the mountain districts of the South, into the States of Virginia, North Carolina, East Tennessee, West Virginia, and Eastern Kentucky; do not bring your political methods into that region. Keep your black districts and enjoy them, but we draw the dead line on you when you come into the mountain districts where the men of both parties hate fraud and where men love the Union. I ask you this in all fairness.

I shall undertake to show, Mr. Speaker, that the worst frauds that were committed in the Ninth district were not perpetrated by natives there. I am glad to have an opportunity to state here publicly that the three chief rascals exposed in this record are not even natives of the State. Frauds are not indigenous in that district. They are imported, just as the cattle disease is, from the lowlands.

You gentlemen are opposed to expansion. I ask you to join me in opposing that form of expansion which carries bad political laws and bad political methods any further. I know the sentiment on this side is in favor of allowing the several States to regulate the suffrage. This side of the House and the American people will demand that these laws shall be reasonably fair in their execution and that they shall be constitutional in substance as well as in form. How much further will you spread your gospel of Goebelism?

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that not only have these Democrats in North Carolina violated their public pledge, which none of them

will deny, but in order to make that promise and their methods effective they have put upon us the Goebel law of Kentucky, the worst they could find in any one of the forty-five States. The time may come when the Republican party of this nation will cease to regard violations of the election laws with forbearance.

The time may come when your gospel of Goebelism will spread across the Potomac, northward across the Ohio, and westward across the Mississippi; and when it does come you will find that great stretch of country simply absolutely controlled by political machines, with the element of chance and of choice eliminated, with no power left in the people to protect themselves. I pray to God that my own State will vote it down—not the law, Mr. Speaker, that is already on us—but the constitutional amendment by which they propose to make the law perpetual—a proposition which puts into force immediately the very provision that they asked the people to pass upon at the polls.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS] stated that this Ninth district in which the contest arises is Democratic. Now, my friend, why did you not tell the whole story? I ask it respectfully. The gentleman is not aware, perhaps, that the Ninth district is apt to be Republican when the Republican heart, the great county of Mitchell, is in the district; but when that is taken away, as your friends have cut it out within the last few months, then the district might perhaps be claimed as Democratic.

If it is Democratic, why did you want to cut the Republican part out of it? If it is Democratic, why did you want to resort to the methods of Goebel in order to be sure of a majority—in order, as Henry Watterson says, "to eliminate the element of chance?"

Mr. KLUTTZ. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. PEARSON. Oh, yes; certainly.

Mr. KLUTTZ. I ask the gentleman whether Mitchell County was not originally, up to four years ago, in the district where it is now, and whether the gentleman himself did not have it put in the Ninth district for his own benefit?

Mr. PEARSON. The gentleman wants a candid answer—

Mr. KLUTTZ. Yes.

Mr. PEARSON. And I tell him that ever since the formation of the State of North Carolina, until 1891, the county of Mitchell was a part of the Ninth or westernmost district of North Carolina; and if the gentleman is at all posted, he knows that fact. His party cut it out for political gain, and when the Republican party came back to power they restored it, as they had the right to do.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Was it not taken out of that district by the regular apportionment of the State under the census of 1890?

Mr. PEARSON. Oh, yes; it was taken out in 1891.

Mr. KLUTTZ. And was it not put back by you and your party for purely partisan purposes?

Mr. PEARSON. On the contrary, it was simply restoring stolen goods to the lawful owner. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KLUTTZ. I beg the gentleman's pardon. It looks to me more like stealing than restoring stolen goods, when the county was taken out of the district into which it had been put by the apportionment made by the legislature of North Carolina.

Mr. PEARSON. As I am a guest here, I shall have to submit to any sort of hospitality—good, bad, or indifferent.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken more time on these preliminary observations than I had intended. I come now to the first proposition, that I—even I, a Southern Republican—am entitled to the same construction of the law that a Democrat is entitled to; and I am here to tell my Republican friends—those of you who did not hear it yesterday—that in the legislature of North Carolina this statute was construed; and it was construed to be mandatory.

The man who had been attorney-general of the State and was then a member of the State senate said that if the supreme court should hold that this law was not mandatory, it would hold that the Ten Commandments were not mandatory. And under this construction that Democratic senate of North Carolina turned out two Republican senators and put in their places two Democrats from this very district on this very point, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WEEKS], who has looked into this question, knows.

We may not have the "equal protection of the laws" guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution; but, gentlemen of the Democratic party, if there is any sense of fairness left in you, are you not willing to swallow the medicine that you administer to others? I want to ask, who can complain that this House follows that construction? The law which the gentleman from North Carolina read yesterday has been repealed. He might as well have talked about something that happened before the flood. The only construction which this statute has received is the legislative construction. I ask the same interpretation—nothing more.

No Democrat can complain of it, because the Democrats of that body were unanimous. The vote was 34 to 6. No lawyer can object to it, for the very reason that all the lawyers so construed it. I respectfully submit to my honorable competitor that he can not object to that construction, because he has asked the committee himself to adopt that construction. And it was only after he

found that he had cut off the branch of the tree upon which, as he thought, he was securely perched, and that it landed him on the ground upon the flat of his back, that he comes in now and says, "Oh, no; it is not mandatory; it is simply directory."

He asks now that the vote of Montezuma Township be rejected altogether and that the result of the election there shall be declared null and void. I say, Very well; let it go; let it be stricken out, if he wishes. I got a majority of 74 there, but let that majority be stricken from the record, if he will. But what is the effect, Mr. Speaker? The same construction rejects South Waynesville and Marble, which gave contestee 289 majority.

I submit that no Christian can object to that construction. There is no man who believes in the Sermon on the Mount who can oppose this construction. "For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

Is not that good morals? Is not that good common sense? Is not that fair politics? Is it not simple justice? And I ask only justice in this case—nothing more.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this House will place any other construction on the statute to which I have referred. I could read and cite authorities here by the hour, if I had the time, as to the construction which has been placed upon such a statute by various States in the Union. I submit that the body which enacts a law is the best judge of its purpose and meaning.

Three ballot boxes were stuffed, according to the testimony, one while the voting was going on, another while the count was in progress, but the most flagrant, the most remarkable one of all, which is not mentioned in the report of the committee, was the ballot box at Ogretta, which was stuffed after the election was over.

A number of defective ballots were cast there on election day, but by the subsequent stuffing of good ballots into the box the bad could not be separated from the good. There were found on the recount more ballots in that box than there were voters in the precinct, counting all that have died or removed in five years' time.

We now come to South Waynesville, at which old tickets were found in the box.

Now, I submit to the gentleman from Indiana that in all candor, when we come to the consideration of this particular precinct, careful attention should be given to this testimony, and I ask the attention of the House, who must act upon this controversy and on that testimony. W. D. Young testifies that these old tickets which were put into the box were Congressional tickets, and that he saw Pearson's name on some of them. This man's testimony is not impeached in any way.

We have three Republicans, two corroborating Young as to the time when they were discovered, as to the character of the tickets, as to the space they occupied in the box, and we have the testimony of three unimpeached Republicans swearing against two Democrats. Here is the question to be decided here, gentlemen: Will you believe three Republicans swearing at right angles with two Democrats, when those Republicans are corroborated by a presumption of law and when those Democrats are impeached by a presumption of law?

What was that presumption? I should like the attention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]. The law presumes that every officer of election does his duty. If the officers of the election at that contest in 1896 did their duty, they put those tickets into the right box for preservation, and that was the Congressional box; and if so, they were Congressional ballots. If they were Congressional ballots, you threw out of that box 84 votes with the name of Richmond Pearson as a candidate for Congress.

I do not know where you threw them, but I do know that according to the testimony of F. W. Miller a batch of tickets presented, alleged to be the tickets found in that box, most of them county tickets, did contain the name of a candidate for Congress in the election of 1898, and, more than that, that very batch of tickets, in addition to the presumption of law which discredits your witnesses, caused a false—I will not say false—an incorrect count to be made of the box.

This House would not be willing to accept the returns from a ballot box which was one-third full of tickets at sunrise on election morning. Who can know, except the Lord God on high, what kind of tickets were in there when the voting began? There is no proof, there can be no proof, only we have these suspicious circumstances and this conflict of testimony.

Mr. Speaker, as an old Union soldier it will astonish you to know that a Federal soldier at that precinct, by the name of A. B. Taylor, swears that he was offered \$2 to vote the Democratic ticket, and the offer came to him from a negro. To what base uses had they come at last when it is proposed to buy the vote of a Union soldier and a Republican, and the money was offered by a negro, and the negro at the same time told him that he had already bought four or five Republicans in the same way.

I do not object to being fair with you, gentlemen. But when, as the evidence shows, your partisans down there bought five-sixths of the negro votes at one precinct and seven-eighths of the

negro vote at another precinct, and when you had negro agents undertaking to bribe and to buy Union soldiers, white men, I say I draw the line on that. And I do not believe this House will justify or approve any such methods.

Mr. Speaker, the third proposition that I have to discuss is with regard to these forged letters. The committee say, and their statement is quoted by the minority:

It is impossible for the committee to define the scope or to estimate the effect, in precise words or figures of arithmetic, of the influence of intimidation, of the circulation of these letters, of the bribing of Republicans to stay away from the polls, and of mob violence on the night preceding and on the day of election. We have no hesitation in reaching the conclusion that these unlawful methods and proceedings, operating concurrently, are sufficient to overturn contestee's plurality of 238 votes; and if nothing else appeared in this case, these reprehensible and dishonest methods resorted to by partisans of the contestee would justify the House in declaring a vacancy.

Now, gentlemen, I do not know that any one of you has ever been put in the predicament in which these letters placed me. I will read one as a sample:

ASHEVILLE, N. C., November 6.

DEAR SIR: Mr. J. N. Morgan will hand you \$9 on the morning of the election. See him, and work until sundown for our ticket. We look to Ivy for a big majority.

Very truly,

RICHMOND PEARSON.

Mr. J. M. WHITTEMORE, Barnardsville, N. C.

Here is another one:

ASHEVILLE, N. C., November 6.

MY DEAR SIR: See J. R. Brigman on election morning and get \$25 handed him for you to use on that day. Use this money quietly, and we hope for good returns from your precinct.

Truly,

RICHMOND PEARSON.

Per M.

Mr. W. S. ROBERTS, Flat Creek.

In the notice of contest I branded those as false and spurious. In the brief that was printed I branded them as false and spurious. In the presence of my competitor and in the presence of this body I here now brand every word in those letters as a lie, "black as the damning drops that fell from the accusing angel's pen." And those letters were circulated in precincts which had been Republican from the date of their formation, and in the very precincts where Democratic money, \$3 at a time, Democratic cash, was exchanged in this hand as against a false Republican promise in that.

How would any of you gentlemen like to wake up the morning after the next election and find your name signed to bogus checks which had gone to protest in every precinct in your district and your name had been forged, and the majority taken away from you by such methods? Gentlemen of neither side of the House will justify such conduct. The committee have decided that that question alone, coupled with intimidation and bribery of voters to stay away from the polls, was sufficient to overcome this majority of 238.

Mr. Speaker, I shall have to hurry. I will not be able to read these figures. The gentleman from Indiana stated yesterday that Mr. Crawford did not run behind his ticket in this election, when he undertook to show that there was, opposition what he called persistent, relentless opposition, to me in the Republican ranks. The best answer I can make to that, Mr. Speaker, is to ask that these figures shall go into the RECORD. They show that I ran ahead of the men associated with me on that ticket, and that my competitor ran behind the men associated with him.

County.	Eaves vote.	Hoke vote.
Buncombe.....	3,868	4,438
Cherokee.....	939	972
Clay.....	365	437
Graham.....	379	370
Haywood.....	1,041	1,853
Henderson.....	1,313	1,048
Jackson.....	997	1,156
Macon.....	971	1,050
Madison.....	2,154	1,272
McDowell.....	1,017	1,257
Mitchell.....	1,639	672
Polk.....	657	505
Rutherford.....	1,685	2,267
Swain.....	701	744
Transylvania.....	646	603
Yancey.....	850	977
Total.....	19,222	19,617

In 1898 Populists voted for Eaves.

Total vote for Pearson..... 19,368
Total vote for Crawford..... 19,606

I only notice this for the purpose of showing the facts, because it is not discreditable to my political competitor that he did not get the votes. He could not get the votes because I got more than my associates on my ticket. The fact remains there; and it is only introduced here now to show the gentleman from Indiana he will have to have some other reason for turning the majority of 1,306 in 1896 than this alleged unpopularity of Richmond Pearson; for the fact is, and can not be denied, that I got the entire Republican strength of that district, or its equivalent, and the votes I

lost were those that were stolen from me and taken away from me by stuffing ballot boxes and other forms of illegal conduct.

I shall ask, Mr. Speaker, that these figures may go in as a part of my remarks, and shall be obliged to close here, even if I must leave out certain other matters that I had proposed to discuss.

The Ninth Congressional district of North Carolina lies in the bosom of the Appalachian Mountains, where those blue serrated peaks reached nearest the sky above the mists of the lowlands, and often above the clouds. It has been called in romance and in truth the "Land of the sky."

The streams that take their sources in that region run down to Tennessee to water her fertile valleys; they run into the two Carolinas and Georgia, furnishing water power to thousands and hundreds of thousands of spindles and looms that day and night are now singing the praises of Republican policies in successful and beneficent operations.

Mr. Speaker, that region stood for the Union in the late war. Those men had to fight either against their neighbors or against their convictions, and they chose the dread alternative of standing by their convictions, and they are just as loyal and just as solid and as true as the granite-ribbed mountains on whose bosom they dwell.

I ask you, gentlemen, on both sides of the House, to join me now in stamping out the frauds upon their first appearance there that have come into that district. If you do that, we will have some hope even now to meet you in the next election under the handicap of the Goebel law. To say to the world and to say to these rugged mountaineers that you will not condemn the stuffing of ballot boxes, that you will not give them and their representatives the same interpretation of the law that you give the Democrats, will do much to stifle the voice of liberty. I ask you to build a wall around that district so high that robbery can not scale it, so solid that oppression can not shatter it, and so bottomed on the everlasting rock of living truth that thieves can not break through and steal. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to print certain figures in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, if he desires to make his remarks at this time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, if nothing more were involved in this controversy than a mere property right to an office, I would not consume the time of the House in discussing the question further, as my contention has already been so well and ably presented by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS] and my colleague, Mr. KITCHIN. But I conceive there is a greater question at issue than the interest or ambition of any man. There are 200,000 people in the Ninth Congressional district of North Carolina on trial here to-day. This is their case. Under the Constitution of the United States they have the right to say who shall represent them in this body, and for that reason I assume to review the case under the rules and regulations of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset that I am in possession of no stolen property. I am in the rightful possession of a seat in this House. I am here, gentlemen of the majority, by virtue of a certificate issued by the Republican governor of North Carolina, and by a majority of the votes cast under a Republican law, an election controlled by Republican election boards, counted by them, canvassed and certified by them. Therefore, my right to a seat in this House is certainly very strong by presumptive evidence. The burden is on contestant to show a better title by proving his allegations of fraud and corruption.

Since the district was organized, in 1883, the Democrats have carried it five times, in 1884, 1886, 1890, 1892, and 1898. The Republicans carried it in 1888, and the Fusionists, led by Mr. Pearson as an independent candidate, carried it as then constituted in 1894 by 135 majority.

Let us review it briefly and see how it stands. I want to say that no man has ever charged that there was fraud or gross irregularity in that district, since it has been a district, until in this instance. Every man who has been defeated has stepped down and out and bowed to the will of the people, save Mr. Pearson, and he alone refuses to recognize defeat. Senator PRITCHARD quietly submitted when I defeated him in 1892. Mr. Ewart stepped down and out in 1890 when I defeated him, and Captain Johnston stepped down and out in 1888, when Mr. Ewart defeated him; and not a word of suspicion was ever charged against that district until this contest was instituted.

Mr. KLUTTZ. And you stepped down and out, did you not?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; I stepped down and out when contestant defeated me by the narrow margin of 135 votes in 1894. Nobody said a word; nobody said there was fraud; nobody said there was bribery; nobody said there was corruption; everybody bowed to the sovereign will of the people. But contestant, I will say in all candor, has never been defeated many times. He has been a lucky man. He is a tolerably old man, older than I am, and it is a matter of history that he has never lost but one

vote for President of the United States, and that was for General Hancock in 1880. He stood by all the other winning men. He trimmed his political sails so as to march under the banners of the victors. He actually supported me for Congress against Mr. PRITCHARD in 1892. But the Senator seems to be supporting him in this fight.

He is not accustomed to defeat, but I can not help that. Other men have known it, we have all gone down on the field of battle; we have seen our old flag go into the dust and have seen it rise again in that district. We have met in deadly combat for the mastery, but when the smoke cleared up partisan enemies became personal friends.

I desire to say to my Republican friends that no man has ever distributed Federal patronage in the Ninth district of North Carolina and survived the Administration, the contestant not excepted. His fate has been the fate of all. You, gentlemen, know something about the joy of dividing a few offices among numerous friends, I suppose. He has not lost so heavily as some of you. You make no allowance for losses in his case. Let me review it. In Indiana I notice heavy losses in most all of the districts; also in Illinois, Iowa, and many other States.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS], who submits the report, has lost some votes also. His district was carried by 6,200 in 1896, and in 1898 by 1,728. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCHRANE] who signed this report carried his district in 1896 by over 5,000, and in 1898 he carried it by 28. What caused these losses? Was it fraud and corruption? Mr. Pearson lost from the vote of 1896 only 1,127 votes. That was pretty good for an off year, was it not? I gained over the Democratic vote 417 only; no very large loss or gain there.

My colleague [Mr. LINNEY] lost over 1,300 from his vote in 1896, yet he holds his seat because he had a larger margin than contestant.

Now, gentlemen, having said this much in regard to the general political situation, I want to review briefly the specific charges upon which the contestant relies for overturning the will of the people at the polls; and I will first take up Waynesville. The contestant, after giving notice of the charges of bribery and fraud and intimidation of voters, comes to the specification and relies solely on technicalities of registration and irregularities of the election boards—points that have been overruled in this House in every instance in which they have been raised—not a single one of them sustained by any party.

South Waynesville cast in 1898 393 votes. The contestant has just said that the vote in 1898 was enormously increased over the vote of 1896. In 1896 it cast 353 votes, so that there was in 1898 a gain of only 40 in a growing, prosperous little town. Was not that enormous? That was sufficient to arouse the suspicions of my friend as to the correctness of that vote. Why? The majority was not on the side of the balance sheet to please him. In 1896 this box gave Adams 274 and Pearson 84; in 1898 it gave me 313 and Pearson 77.

The election law of 1895, as amended by the act of 1897, provides that the registrars shall, on certain days, open the books for registration at the polling place. In a preceding section it is provided that there shall be no registration except as provided in a subsequent section. It is contended by contestant that the law is mandatory and a registration at any other place is void; and he and his friends insist that this precinct ought to be thrown out because the registrars opened the books not at the polling place, but within 150 yards of it, and registered those who had not been registered at the preceding election. It is not alleged, it is not charged, it has not been proved by a single witness, that a single voter was deprived of his opportunity to register and thereby failed to vote.

Why would it have been better if the registration had taken place at the precise location of the polling place? The only object of registration is to ascertain who are qualified electors. This House has held time and again that if the electors do register, if nobody is harmed and no fraud has been committed, then no one has the right to complain of irregularities of the election boards. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], in passing upon that point in the case of Smith vs. Jackson, from West Virginia, where the polling place had been removed three-quarters of a mile, said in his report to the House:

It is to be observed that no allegation of any specific act of fraud is alleged. Your committee are asked to presume that fraud was committed because it might have been committed, and this in the absence of any pretense that a single legal vote was excluded from or a single illegal vote was included in the result announced. Your committee do not know of any principle of law that would justify them in so finding. They understand the law to be as declared in Mann vs. Cassidy: "An allegation of fraud committed by an election officer is immaterial unless it be also stated that the result has been affected."

Mr. DALZELL further says in the same case:

Contestee charges that the voting place in this precinct, established by order of the county court, was McGills post-office, but that the election was held at Isaacs Branch schoolhouse, one-half to three-quarters of a mile distant from the post-office. The evidence tends to prove the above statement, but it is not claimed, nor does the evidence tend to show, that any person was

deceived or prevented from voting thereby. * * * This calls for the application of the rule which protects the voter against disfranchisement from the default of a public officer when such default has resulted in no injury to anyone.

Notice was given, and everybody registered.

W. D. Young, witness and supporter of contestant, says:

Q. Don't you know that notice was given by the registrars where the registration books would be kept open, and that everybody entitled to register had an opportunity of so doing?

A. Yes, sir; there was notice given where it would be kept open at; I think that everybody registered that had a right to register, as far as I know.

W. H. Faucett, one of the registrars, says:

Q. Please state the location of your office, in which some of the voters were registered, with respect to the polling place; and how far is it from the polling place?

A. My office is on Main street and about 150 yards from the polling place; not over that. There was no fire at the polling place, and the registration was at my office as a matter of convenience to the registrars.

Q. Did not every voter in South Waynesville precinct entitled to register have an opportunity of so doing?

A. Yes; I heard of no complaint from anyone, and nobody objected to the registration being done in my office.

A MEMBER. How many judges on each side?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Democrats, Republicans, and Populists each had a judge and a registrar.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. They were equally divided among the different parties?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, sir; and there was fusion in North Carolina between the Populists and the Republicans in those years, so there were in fact but two parties, fusionists and Democrats; and it is alleged in the notice of the contestant that they had fusion in 1898 and cooperated in this fight against me; and at this very polling place in Waynesville the opposition had four members of the board and I had one.

The son of the Democratic judge fell and broke his arm, and for that reason the judge was excused; and Major Stringfield, a man who has been assailed here by the gentleman from Massachusetts and insinuated against by the contestant, was substituted by the Republican and the Populist judges under the law; and he was a judge *de jure*; and his act as judge in counting these votes can not be questioned. The appointment was made under section 7 of the election law. Major Stringfield took the ballots out of the box, called the names, and handed them to a member of the board for inspection and verification.

Nobody insinuated that anything was wrong. A more respectable, high-toned, Christian gentleman than Major Stringfield does not live in North Carolina, and nobody knows it better than the contestant. He was appointed by these men because he was trustworthy.

Was contestant prejudiced? The vote cast at that box was 393, as returned. At another box, where there was no irregularly appointed judge in charge of it, 393 votes were cast and returned for the candidates for sheriff. In that box there were no old tickets. The contestant ran 12 votes ahead of the Republican candidate for sheriff, and I ran 15 votes behind the Democratic candidate for sheriff. What harm was done him? It seems that I might complain. The poll books showed that 395 votes had been cast. At that box the number of votes fell 2 short of the number recorded in the poll book; and 2 ballots were found among these old tickets by contestant, and they were my tickets, so I lost 2 votes. And now the contestant quibbles about those 2 ballots having been found among the old tickets. This being the first time ballots had been preserved under the law, and the judges not being familiar with their new duties, they failed to remove the old tickets for 1896 at the time the polls were opened.

So when they were separated from the ballots of 1898 they were put in a box, locked up, and turned over to the clerk of the court. The testimony is not contradictory. The judges of election—Republicans, Democrats, and Populists—agreed there among themselves that they would put those old tickets in a box and lock them up and turn them over to the clerk of the court, so that in the event there was any dispute about it they would have the tickets as evidence. His own witness, and the only witness that he has in regard to that box, is W. D. Young, and here is what he says was done. I call the attention of Republicans to it, because there was no dispute in the evidence as to what was done and how it was done. Mr. Young says:

Q. Were you present at South Waynesville box in the evening when the counting out was going on? If so, please state who was doing the counting, and what occurred.

A. I was present at that box when the counting out occurred, and Major Stringfield was taking the ballots out of the box and reading them off, and handed them over to Mr. Brendle as he would call them. Mr. Brendle was one of the registrars of the election. Mr. Mull was there. He was one of the judges, I think. He was counting out of another box, probably. Major Stringfield was counting out of the State box, I think. Mr. Bramlett was there. He was another one of the judges. When they got the ballots out, down toward the bottom of the box they found some old tickets that had been voted two years ago, or just like some that had been voted two years ago. These tickets were State tickets and contained the names of the candidates for Congress.

That was his opinion, that they were State tickets. I was not a

candidate in 1896; the contestant was. Those tickets were preserved. If Mr. Young is right, he ought to have been corroborated by the ballots found in the box. Now, listen:

Q. Did you examine any of these tickets?

A. I looked at them; I didn't look at all of them. Major called attention to the fact when he found the old tickets in the box, and they sorted them out, the Pearson and Crawford tickets from the Pearson and Adams tickets; only the Pearson and Crawford tickets were counted; the Pearson and Adams tickets were not counted at all.

And if his contention had proved correct, how could it benefit contestant? He swears positively that the tickets were not confused; "that anyone who could read could tell the old and new tickets apart," and that they were separated and not counted.

Major Stringfield swears that the old tickets were county tickets:

When we neared the bottom of the box I noticed quite a number of tickets, which, upon investigation, I found to be old county tickets of two years ago that by some inadvertence had been left in the box. These old tickets, I might say, seemed to be evenly scattered over the bottom of the box and were somewhat discolored with age, and were of a smaller size than the new tickets voted that day, and were easily discernible. I carefully went through all these old tickets, and I perhaps found one or two recently voted tickets. I remember counting two Republican tickets with the name of Mr. Boggs, Populist candidate for Congress. After a careful investigation of all the tickets in that box, these old tickets were all put in another box, locked up, and the key given to Mr. Brendle, the Republican judge—I mean the Populist judge. The new tickets were put in the box that they had been originally voted into. My recollection is that Mr. Bramlett took the keys to that box.

Q. Did you discover among these old tickets, when you were making an examination of them, any ballots with either Crawford's or Pearson's name upon them?

A. I did not; I had previously gathered from the surface of these old tickets every ticket that had been cast that day.

Q. So the ballots cast that day for Pearson and Crawford had been counted out before these old tickets were discovered?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Could you not readily distinguish the tickets which you describe as old tickets from the ballots cast that day?

A. No trouble to distinguish between them. Old tickets were much smaller and somewhat discolored and more or less defaced or scratched.

J. K. Boone, clerk of the court, says:

When the count of the vote was very nearly completed in the State and Congressional box Major Stringfield, who was reading the ballots, stated that he observed some old county tickets in the box, and called attention to the fact to the judges and registrars and others present; I think he asked what they must do about it; someone suggested to count out all the ballots cast in the election of 1898, and examine the box carefully and see that they got them all out; he did so, at that suggestion, taking all the new votes out from the top without disturbing the old votes, or as much so as possible; after that was done he looked through the ballots in the box—the old ballots, county tickets—and stated that the old ballots and the new ones had been separated and the new ones all counted.

Young further says:

Q. About how many of the Pearson and Adams tickets were found in the box, and what was done with them, if you know?

A. I couldn't tell how many there were. There might have been some other tickets in there. There might have been some two or three hundred, maybe more, maybe less. I don't know what they did with them; I do know they wasn't counted.

Ought not that to settle it? There is a great deal of dust raised here before you gentlemen who have not investigated this carefully. If I was not elected to represent those people, and if they were guilty of the frauds and the crimes that have been charged in this notice and in this debate, I should not want to represent them.

I want you to get down to the evidence. The contestant talked about the crimes, the frauds, and general rascality of the Democratic party and expatiates on the achievements and glory of the Republican party. But did he refer to the evidence and give a single reason why you should reverse the verdict of the people? Did he cite any law or precedent which warrants this House in doing it? None.

He almost sheds tears about an old soldier being bought, or an offer being made to bribe him by a negro in Waynesville. Look at his notice of contest. He charges that 52 negroes were bribed in this very town to vote for me, and that they were paid money to do it, and he goes there and takes his evidence, and all that he found was that a negro had actually offered an old soldier, a white Republican, a dollar if he would not vote for Pearson, but he voted for him. That is what he found. [Laughter.]

Nothing but your refusal to investigate this case conceals this barefaced effort, unfounded in fact or in law, to deprive these people of their right under the Constitution to representation here of their own choice. Listen to what his own judge says about that Waynesville box. Mr. Mull is a Republican and an honorable man:

Q. Who counted the ballots out of the State box?

A. W. W. Stringfield took them out of the box and called the names over and handed them to J. H. Brendle, who dropped them over in another box.

Q. Who brought the boxes to the polls that morning?

A. I don't recollect who it was.

Q. In counting the ballots out of the State box, state what you found.

A. We found a bunch of old tickets—maybe the box about one-third full.

Q. What was done with these old tickets?

A. They were looked over, and saw that they were old tickets and laid them over on the table.

There it is. Will you deprive all of those 393 people of the right to vote for a member of Congress because the judges of election did not happen to remove those old tickets, when his own witnesses say they separated them and laid them on the table and

did him no harm? All the judges signed returns under their oaths without protest or word of complaint, and the people of all parties were satisfied and believed, and still believe, that the election was fair and honest.

Mr. KLUTTZ. And you lost 2 votes by what they did?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes. He complains and says that the returns are impeached because I lost 2 votes. Let me read further from the testimony of Mr. Mull:

Q. Do you know or remember how many ballots had been counted out of the State box before you knew of the presence of the old tickets?

A. There were but very few found after we discovered the old one.

Q. Who first discovered these old tickets in the box?

A. Major Stringfield.

Q. State what Major Stringfield did or said as soon as these old tickets were discovered.

A. He said that we had voted in on a lot of old tickets.

Q. To whom did he impart this information?

A. To the judges and those present.

Q. What was then done, Mr. Mull?

A. He just looked over them and laid them on the table.

Q. Did anyone else look over the tickets?

A. Mr. Brendle, the clerk, was standing right by him.

That is the testimony of his own witness. Not a word is said about his losing a vote. Not that he was prejudiced, not that he did not get every vote cast for him, but there were old tickets found in the box with the new ones, which were separated from the others and laid out on the table and not counted for anybody, and a few men registered 150 yards from the polling place, and Major Stringfield assisted in the count under the law by appointment of contestant's political friend. I received a large majority of the votes, and therefore the entire poll must be thrown out.

Mr. GILBERT. Has anybody testified in that record that the old tickets were counted?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Nobody. The universal testimony of all the witnesses is that they were not counted, but were separated; and his man, Young, says that anybody who could read could tell the old tickets from the new ones. These are the facts in the case. Now, what do they rely on? They rely on what seems to have been the opinion of a judiciary committee in a contested-election case in the senate of North Carolina to put me out and him in. The Constitution of the United States makes this House the judge of the election, the returns, and the qualifications of its own members. This jurisdiction can not be delegated or transferred to another forum. This House is sitting as a court, and from its judgment there is no appeal. The committee has ignored and repudiated the decisions of this House. They have repudiated the fundamental principles as enunciated by the text writers, and they have overruled and spurned the decision of the supreme court of North Carolina upon the very question involved, and say that they will accept the construction of the statute as given by a State senator of North Carolina, as reported in a newspaper.

I have in my hand a letter from Mr. Osborne, the very gentleman referred to, and I see my distinguished friend from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY] puts stress on it, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] read extracts from a speech of Mr. Osborne in the senate, as reported. I want you to know what was done in that case. I have nothing to conceal. If you will follow the precedent of the North Carolina senate, the contestant has no case before this House.

Here is what Senator Osborne says, and I admit that he is a lawyer of great ability:

The committee held this section 8 to be mandatory in its provisions on account of the negative language used; and inasmuch as in one or two precincts there was registration at other times than those prescribed in section 9, such registration was void—in other words, that it was no registration—but in these precincts there was registration of some voters at the proper time and place.

We did not see how the invalid registration of some voters could affect the validity of voters who were registered at the proper time and place. In order to arrive at the truth, we ordered depositions to be taken to find out who was registered improperly. We did not throw out the whole box because of invalid registration as to the voters. We also held that the burden of proof was upon the contestant to show that the registration of any voter was invalid, the presumption being that the officers in charge of the books acted in accordance with the law.

But to sum up briefly our decision, we held that registration at any other time than that prescribed by the statute was void; that the burden of proof on him who alleged that the registration of any voter was invalid, and that he must establish the allegation by legal testimony, and that the invalid registration of one voter did not affect the validity of the registration of another; because of invalid registration in any precinct that the entire box ought not to be thrown out, but only the votes of those voters who had not registered at the proper time.

There is no similarity between this and the Waynesville case. At Waynesville the registrars registered the new voters within 150 yards of the polling place, and contestant did not attempt to prove who they were or how they voted, and he had two of the registrars on the stand. They had access to and control of the registration books, and he never called for them, but simply asked, "Did you register voters in some place other than the polling place?" "Yes; at his office, 150 yards away." Then with one sweep the committee throw out the entire poll, every vote, 393 of them. In no particular does he follow the precedent which he cites.

Do you want to make that precedent here? Will the majority of this House make the precedent that the election boards, organized and controlled by the political machinery of one party, may hold an election contrary to the provisions of law, either ignorantly or willfully, and thereby invalidate the election? If you make that precedent, I say it will return to trouble you. "The chickens will come home to roost;" "Be sure your sins will find you out;" "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap;" "For with what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged, and with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again." Now, make such a precedent and see what trouble comes to this House. Partisan boards will purposely hold the elections in violation of law in precincts where they are in the minority in order to avoid the election.

In the above case the Democratic contestants proved such votes as were registered on days other than those provided by law, and these only were thrown out. Do you see the distinction? Draw the line. This committee has rejected the entire poll at South Waynesville. These men were legally qualified voters, and the right to vote is a constitutional right, and the supreme court of North Carolina has held that after the ballot has been cast it can not be challenged on account of failure to comply with registration laws. It must be shown that he was not a legal voter. If any gentleman desires to ask me a question about the case, I will honestly give him the facts. I am not implicated. No insinuation has been made against me. There is no charge that I have been guilty of any wrong conduct.

But I resent these wholesale charges against my people, because there are no braver or more honest people living than the people in the mountain district of North Carolina, and I can not believe that the honest men in the Republican party will indorse this wholesale disfranchisement of the people.

The contestant attempted to explain his defeat on the map exhibited, by showing that there is a large negro vote in Buncombe and Rutherford counties and that he lost heavily in those counties. My friends, you would understand that big black bar to be an indication that Buncombe County is a negro county, would you not? According to his own calculation, there were only 1,600 negro voters in that county. What did he say about the whites? Not a word. There were 8,200 votes cast in that county in 1898.

In neither one of these counties was there much change. I want to call your attention to how figures may be juggled. Where is the contestant? I want him to hear what I have to say. I propose to say nothing that is not absolutely true and fortified with evidence on my desk. Take Buncombe and Rutherford, large counties, that cast in 1898 12,425 votes. In Madison and Henderson, large Republican counties with few negro voters, they cast 5,786 votes. In Buncombe and Rutherford the contestant lost only 853 votes from his vote in 1896, about 6 per cent. In these large Republican counties that had only 5,786 votes, where no charge was made, where no evidence was taken, he lost from his vote in 1896, 304 votes, a little more than 5 per cent.

I am sorry the contestant does not lend me his presence. He has left the Hall. I want to say here and now that Buncombe County has never cast a majority against me, and I have been before the people five times. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I carried it in 1890 over Judge Ewart by 584 votes. I carried it over Senator PRITCHARD in 1892 by 525 votes. I carried it over the contestant in 1894, when the tidal wave swept from the mountains to the sea, by 75 majority; and the contestant never has carried Buncombe against me. [Applause.]

I carried it in 1898 by only 470 votes. What do you say to that? It is coming back to its original faith, going back to its first love, and that is all. Buncombe County is a Democratic county, and has never given a Republican majority for Congress but once. So is Rutherford Democratic. Rutherford has never, to my knowledge, gone against the Democratic party for Congress but one time in its history, and that was in the landslide of 1894. Do you see something wonderful in the fact that I carried Buncombe and Rutherford? The election was quiet and orderly throughout the district. The contestant says intimidation and fraud were practiced. How did he prove it? I will tell you. He never proved by a single witness that lives in the Ninth district that there was intimidation. No. He comes all the way to Washington City and forces me to send my attorney to cross-examine a negro appointed by him to an office here as to the intimidation in the city of Asheville.

What does he prove? Henry Benson swears that "Tom Poor told him that Mac Jones said somebody would kill him down there at the election." Is that not hearsay evidence raised to the "quadratic degree?" [Laughter.] None of those great, big-hearted, strong-minded, brave Republicans down there were put on the stand to testify as to intimidation. Here is what some of the leading Republicans and Democrats say as to the character of the election:

Dr. J. H. Wolff, chairman of the Republican executive committee of Jackson County, a member of the senatorial committee, and also a member of the Congressional committee and witness for contestant (page 64):

"Q. Was not the campaign in the Ninth Congressional district and also the election following in 1898 a quiet, peaceable, and orderly one throughout the entire district, as much so as you have ever observed in preceding campaigns?

"A. I don't think that there is any question about that, as far as I know."

James R. Love, chairman of the Populist executive committee of Jackson County, witness for contestant, and his ardent political supporter (page 61):

"Q. I ask you if the campaign and election in 1898 in this county were not quiet, peaceable, and orderly?"

"A. So far as I know it was."

G. M. Roberts, ex-chairman of the Republican executive committee of the district, says (page 235) in regard to Asheville:

"Q. Please state how the election in last November, in respect of the orderly conduct of the voters and the peace and quiet of the day, compared with previous elections for the last thirty years."

"A. A very quiet election in the city; as much so as I have ever seen."

T. F. Davidson, ex-attorney-general of North Carolina, says (page 235): "The canvass was very vigorous on both sides, and I suppose as much political work was done by each political organization as was ever done in the State. The election itself, as far as came under my observation, was remarkably orderly, and I think I have heard fewer complaints of unfairness than in any other instance within my recollection."

F. A. Luck, newspaper correspondent, says (page 229):

"Q. State opportunities, if any, you had of becoming acquainted with the political conditions as they existed in the Ninth Congressional district in 1898."

"A. In the early part of 1898 I was connected with the Waynesville Courier, and the balance of the year, up to the time of the election, I was a special correspondent for the Asheville Citizen."

"Q. As such special correspondent, did you visit the various counties composing the Ninth Congressional district, preceding the election in November, 1898?"

"A. Yes; I visited all the counties in the district, except one, once; some of them more than once. I attended superior courts in Jackson, Swain, Macon, and Cherokee. Then I accompanied Mr. Crawford in his preliminary campaign in all the western counties."

"Q. Did you accompany Mr. Crawford as a candidate for Congress in the joint discussion with Mr. Pearson?"

"A. I was with them at every appointment in the district except two."

"Q. Please state the general character of the discussions between Mr. Crawford and Mr. Pearson during their campaign, and the general state of feeling between the political parties as this campaign progressed."

"A. Everything was pleasant and agreeable, and there was no political disturbance anywhere."

Where is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS]?

A MEMBER. He is standing over there by the door.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; but he does not hear me. I want to call his attention to a great mistake he made in this report. He says on page 2 that Henry Benson testified that there were armed men at the polls in Asheville; that strange men were assembled. He does not say anything of the sort as to their being armed men. He says he saw 25 strangers there, and he was asked if they were armed, and he said they looked like they might have been armed. [Laughter.] That is all he said, and yet the gentleman from Massachusetts and the contestant deliberately wrote in the report that such a thing occurred. And right on the same page, what else? He says that Henry Benson—and he is the officeholder at Washington—swears that the negroes were not allowed to organize clubs in Asheville. He said nothing of the sort. He said he did not attend any club meeting.

Will you gentlemen accept this report without inquiry? It is discredited. It is not only partisan, but untrue. The vote in 1898 was substantially the same as the vote in 1896, right along the line, about 40,000, a little gain here and a little loss there. You gentlemen do not appreciate it where you have six or eight thousand majority, but when you get down to where you have only two or three hundred votes as a margin, it counts for something. James Blythe, the big Indian, a Republican leader and manipulator, swears that the election in the Indian country was fair and honest. In the notice contestant charges that there was fraud and intimidation among the Indians. One Indian after another swears that they voted and were not molested. So the charge was abandoned in the brief. You want to know how the contestant was defeated, and I want to help you to find out.

Dr. Wolff is a member of the Congressional executive committee; was one of the contestant's chiefs, one of his fighting men. What does Dr. Wolff say? I read from his testimony:

"Q. Did you not state on the piazza in the post-office, or the hotel at Dillsboro, or some other place, that Mr. Crawford had been fairly elected to Congress, in your opinion, and that Mr. Pearson's defeat was due to the fact that a number of leading Republicans in the Ninth district wanted him shelved?"

"A. No, sir; I did not say it anywhere. I have said time and again that, in my opinion, that Mr. Pearson was too big a man for the Republican party."

Great heavens! That is notice on me that he is coming back to the Democratic party, I suppose. I shall plead the statute of limitations against him. [Laughter.]

I have said time and again that, in my opinion, Mr. Pearson was too big a man for the Republican party, and that others who would like to have been the recipient of his nomination intended to elect him by as small a majority as possible, in order that he might be shelved; that in so doing they had evidently miscalculated the intentions of such men as old man Roberts, Hunt, and the like, and thereby caused his defeat.

Mr. DE GRAFFENREID. Was that witness a Republican?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, sir; a great big Republican, who fought the battle for the contestant and was a staff officer. That is his statement on the witness stand as to the causes of the contestant's defeat.

Mr. DE GRAFFENREID. He is a member of the Republican executive committee?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, sir; a member of the Republican executive committee, a member of the senate committee, and chairman of the county executive committee; he has all the political badges of honor on his coat.

Who was Roberts? Roberts was a former chairman of the Republican executive committee of the district. He took up arms against the contestant in the November election; he fought against him and helped to defeat him.

Who is Hunt? Colonel Hunt resided formerly in Indiana; went down to North Carolina and located in Asheville. He organized what he called the Northern Settlers' Republican Club. He voted against the contestant and says that he had as much to do as anybody else in defeating Mr. Pearson.

Asheville has been largely settled by Northern people, and Colonel Hunt says that many of the Republicans voted against contestant. Mr. John B. Eaves was at one time chairman of the Republican State executive committee, and he campaigned the district for me in 1898. He is a Republican and was honorably mentioned by the newspapers for nomination as governor before the last convention.

Why, gentlemen, actually in Clay County they had to run a candidate for sheriff who was supporting me, and also a candidate for surveyor. The Republican chairman of 1896 supported me, and gave me 3 majority in his precinct, while the Republican local ticket ran 43 ahead of the Democratic ticket. I carried the county by 132, and the Democratic candidate for the legislature carried it by only 15.

These things explain the cause of the break in the Republican party. The wonder is that he was not beaten worse. There was no such thing as intimidation. In order to show intimidation the contestant and his friends go away down to Wilmington district, where they say Senator TILLMAN made a speech on the Saturday before the election in which he said: "These negroes are progressing to such an extent that you will either have to clip them or nip them."

The people of the Ninth district of North Carolina are not so easily frightened. I doubt whether there was a man in the district who read of the speech. It was 300 miles away and only two days before the election. It is too absurd to discuss.

Now, gentlemen, I come to Asheville. They now want to get rid of the report throwing out Asheville, on condition it does not defeat Mr. Pearson. The contestant stands upon this floor and says that he has always been opposed to throwing out the city of Asheville; and he appeals to the recollection of members of the committee as to his position. The back districts are being heard from, and he wants to "withdraw for repairs." What an anomalous situation we have here! The contestant says to this House, "The committee has gone far beyond my demands. Amend the report; strike out those things which I have never approved. Save my people from being disfranchised, provided you first save me." And the gentleman from Massachusetts, who presumably prepared the report, stands up and, in the language of Lady Macbeth, says, "Out, damned spot!" But it will not out; it is written there—and all the perfumes of Arabia will never make that report sweet-scented. [Applause.]

The contestant and the committee are backing out from that report. They beg the House to let them undo it. Two pages are devoted in giving reasons why Asheville should be rejected. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY] positively declared on the floor of this House yesterday that he was not in favor of throwing out the city of Asheville. Will he vote to do it? We shall see. I can not think the House will vote to disfranchise 2,567 citizens on the ground that a negro was arrested three months after the election on a warrant for perjury. The committee say that other witnesses might have been intimidated by reason of the arrest, and that Mr. Murphy's object was to intimidate them and keep them from testifying in this case. The negro swore that Mr. Murphy, my attorney, had offered him money to get a certain number of negroes to vote the Democratic ticket, but that he got no money and voted for contestant. Mr. Murphy swore that he never spoke to the negro and offered him nothing to secure votes or to vote the Democratic ticket; and there is no more honorable man in North Carolina than J. D. Murphy.

How are you to separate the good from the bad in this report? Where is to be the line of demarcation? The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] says that he would eliminate Asheville, and not throw it out; but it is on condition that he must throw out enough from other places to put the contestant in! [Applause.] This is a reckless attempt to disfranchise the people of Asheville.

Mr. Speaker, here is the opinion of the governor of North Carolina in regard to this case, which has been referred to already in the course of the discussion. You heard a part of his statement read on yesterday on the floor of the House. I propose to give you other extracts, and I ask your attention, gentlemen, because this man can have no personal interest in this controversy.

Now, whatever may be said of Governor Russell, he is an old "stand-by," a faithful adherent, and a consistent advocate of the principles of his party. He is a member of the Republican party, and has been all his life, has been a member of this House, is the governor of the State of North Carolina, and at the head of

the Republican party in that State. He has served his party faithfully, and there is no question of his loyalty. He has followed the Republican banner wherever it has gone, and I do not believe that among the Republicans in the State of North Carolina, or wherever he is known, his fidelity to his party and to his platform will be denied. He is a lawyer of ability and has the reputation of calling a spade by its name. He said:

Pearson's attempt to steal the Ninth district does not hurt his reputation. It only sustains it. But the late Republican convention, in permitting Pearson to smuggle through a resolution commending himself and his contest, but for the fact, perhaps, that most of the convention did not know it was in the platform would have disgraced the Republican party of North Carolina.

The State convention meets; it appoints a committee on resolutions and platform. Pearson schemes to get himself at the head of the committee. He fixes the resolutions, especially the one which extols himself and condones his contemplated larceny.

I do not use these words so strongly myself. I am a mild-mannered man. [Laughter.]

And then what a sight for the gods. A platform denouncing fraud and demanding honesty—this platform prepared and reported and read (with a sickly effort toward the dramatic) by a man who has been, is now, and was at that moment making the supreme effort of his life to disfranchise by bald fraud all the voters of the city of Asheville and to steal a seat in Congress by methods substantially as lawless and desperate as those which are known of all men to prevail in the nonsuffrage States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what the only Republican governor in the Southern States has to say of a contest which is now pending before this body.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman yield to me for an inquiry?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Had there not been serious threats by the Democratic party of North Carolina, by legislative action, of impeaching the governor of that State, the Republican governor, to whom the gentleman is referring?

Mr. CRAWFORD. There has been nothing of that kind said or done in the State, except in some newspapers; no attempt of the kind has been made. I am not aware that the governor has committed any impeachable offense.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Is not the legislature of North Carolina now adjourned until June, and in that interval, between the adjournment and the reassembling of the legislature, has not the interview to which the gentleman has referred, and which has been so extensively published, been given out between the adjournment and the extra session which will be held in June for the purpose of forestalling certain charges and meeting just this condition to which I refer?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, that is a direct reflection upon the governor of the State of North Carolina, and I resent it. He is too bold a man to be bulldozed in that way, I should think, and there is no thought of such a thing being done. I resent the insinuation of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. We understand that. Will you simply say yes or no to that question?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Anybody knows that the interview comes between the time of the adjournment and reconvening of the legislature. Perhaps that satisfies you.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And furthermore, have there not been serious charges made by the Democratic press and by Democrats of that State against that same governor?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, he has been criticised; just as the gentleman has been criticised. There are men there who would impeach him, doubtless, and would impeach the gentleman from Ohio, too, perhaps. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have no personal controversy with the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I know it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And he need not attempt to create sympathy on this side of the House by any such attacks as that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, I make no attacks. And I want no sympathy; I want justice.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have asked you whether this very governor—and that is the logic of my question—

Mr. CRAWFORD. Make it plain and short.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Whether that very governor did not make that interview to conciliate the attack upon him that is hanging over him in the coming session of the legislature?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not believe a word of it, and it is an insinuation against the the governor of North Carolina that I resent, as I said a moment ago, Republican as he is. I have said he is a brave, bold man. This is not the language of a coward. The Democratic party would not think of impeaching a high official except for high crime.

Mr. GROSVENOR. How much of a Republican has he been since he was elected? How many times has he been in accord with his party?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If you want to wash your dirty linen by reconciling Republican inconsistencies, do it, but do not do it in my time. I have only a few minutes more—

Mr. GROSVENOR. All right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is a matter between yourselves, and I care nothing about it, whether he is a good Republican or a bad one.

Mr. STEELE. You bring him up as a witness, however.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; he voluntarily appears in court. He proceeds:

The truth is, he was fairly beaten. His real complaint is that he did not get votes enough. The plain men of the mountains have had enough of him. They know that he has nothing in common with them—no sympathy with their struggles, their labors, or their wants. They do not care to be represented by a man who, as they know, would not willingly sacrifice the mint in his morning julep to save them and theirs from the pangs of the damned.

And again the governor says:

"Do other Republicans, Governor, think about Pearson as you do?"

"Yes. Colonel Lusk and Mr. Smathers think about his contest just as I do. They say that Crawford ought to want Pearson to be seated because it means a sweep for Crawford next November. They think it is worse than that. It means the loss to us of many seats in the legislature. What is the use of our making the great issue as to honesty in elections if our own party should perpetrate such a fraud as this?"

"Why, just think of it! The whole vote of the city of Asheville is to be flung in the ditch because a colored man was arrested for perjury committed during the contest, long after the election! Why not throw out the whole vote of Buncombe county? And as to that, why not all the Democratic votes in the district? Every voter in the precinct of South Waynesville is to be disfranchised on the excuse that those of them who were newly registered were registered three or four hundred feet from the spot where the polls were held, everybody having a fair chance to register and nobody losing his vote and nobody defrauded or prejudiced by the failure to have the books on the very spot where the polls were held.

I hope I will have the attention of the gentleman from Ohio. He is very busy just now.

"And as for the great body of those registered in previous years, no irregularity even charged! And with this sort of a record upon us, we are to go around ranting about Democratic fraud!"

"An ounce of civet, good apothecary, to sweeten the stink!"

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS] telegraphed Governor Russell asking whether the above interview was correctly reported, and received the following:

RALEIGH, N. C., May 9, 1900.

To Hon. ROBERT W. MIERS, Member of Congress:

Report of interview in Raleigh Post and Charlotte Observer is authorized and correct.

DANIEL L. RUSSELL.

That is what your Republican governor says about this contest. Now, gentlemen—

Mr. THAYER. Impress the fact that the Republicans would not join with Mr. ROBERTS in this report.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to call attention of the House to the fact that the subcommittee who had this case under consideration reported back in my favor, or, rather, failed to make a report.

Mr. BARTLETT. Two Republicans and one Democrat.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Two Republicans and one Democrat constituted the subcommittee to which this case was referred, and it is presumed that they investigated it under the law, and in view of the evidence. They come back to the committee and say that the contestant has no claim—that is, two of the three so say. The gentleman from Massachusetts who called up the case submitted a report in the full committee on his own responsibility, and it was signed without further investigation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. You state that two Republicans and one Democrat reported against the contestant?

Mr. CRAWFORD. There were two of the three against the contestant when they got back to the full committee.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Can you give the names of those two Republicans?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; I can give the names.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Who were they?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. DRISCOLL, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. MIERS composed the subcommittee. Mr. MIERS and Mr. DRISCOLL stood for me. If the gentleman would ask and find out what the opinion of the distinguished gentleman from New York is, he would find that there is no excuse for this contest, and it is a quibble, and there is nothing in it.

Mr. DRISCOLL said that, and yet you gentlemen are asked to follow blindly the report which has been submitted, and deprive 19,606 men of the right of representation in this House and elect a man who was honestly defeated. Take it back to your own homes; take it to your constituencies and measure it according to their idea of fair dealing, and see how it is. Carlyle said that "Louis the XV had a religious faith sufficient to believe in a devil." If this House has even that much faith, I shall not fear the result.

They have searched that district and combed it, as it were, with a fine-tooth comb, from Cherokee to Rutherford, county by county, box by box, hunting for irregularities and frauds, and have found nothing more than will necessarily occur anywhere.

As to Black Mountain. Contestant charges that Harry Martin, a judge of the election, was seen taking ballots out of the county box and putting other tickets in the box in lieu of them.

The Republican board appointed him a judge. He is a man of good character and has the respect and confidence of the people who know him. The witnesses who testified to this fact say that they saw it, and yet they say they made no protest. They say they stood there and saw this man take the ballots out of the box and put others in their place, and yet they did not protest, and the judges signed the returns, and these witnesses swear that they informed the Republican judge of the fact at the time, and he signed the returns without objection and said it was a very pleasant election.

It seems to me that these men are too cowardly, even if they are telling the truth, to be believed. Do you suppose that a man that is honest enough to tell the truth would stand by and see his party robbed and make no effort to stop it? I believe no such theory. An honest, truthful man would put his life at issue on the spot. One of these witnesses, Morris, swore that he saw Martin taking tickets out of the box and putting them in his pocket. On cross-examination he swore that he did not know that Martin had any tickets or took any out of the box; that he saw none. That is the evidence he is relying upon. The neighbors of those witnesses did not give them a good character.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This man they are accusing is a Republican?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; a Democrat. He was appointed by their board; he is a gentleman of character, and they attack him and say that he made an assault upon the White House. It developed in the testimony that when he was a schoolboy he and some chums got on a "little razzee," and by accident some window panes were broken in the White House. It is manifestly unjust to drag this incident into this case. It is not pretended that anyone interfered with the Congressional box—that the ballots were not honestly cast and fairly counted. Still they threw it out.

As to bribery, there is evidence that 8 men received consideration to vote the Democratic ticket, and that \$10 was divided among 9 men in a township where I received 6 votes, and that is all.

Contestant put C. B. Moore on the stand. He is a leading Republican, and was secretary of the Congressional executive committee. On cross-examination he admitted that he had distributed a large amount of money among the voters the night after the election. Here is what he says:

Q. I ask you if you did not have, on several occasions, in your possession, as secretary of that committee, several hundred one-dollar bills?

A. I never, at any one time, had more than \$450 in one-dollar and two-dollar bills belonging to the Republican Congressional executive committee.

Q. Did you have any such denomination of money in your possession during the campaign for any other committee than the Congressional committee, or for any other person, for campaign purposes?

A. I acted as treasurer of the county campaign fund, and as such treasurer was furnished by that committee with one-dollar and two-dollar bills aggregating some \$600 or \$800.

Q. Who furnished you those bills?

A. I think that I got the greater part of them, if not all, from the Battery Park Bank.

Q. Who contributed those bills that you got the money for, or any check or other thing which enabled you to get those bills at the Battery Park Bank?

A. I contributed in part, Mr. Harkins contributed some—H. S. Harkins I mean—Mr. Pearson contributed some.

Q. Do you know why one-dollar and two-dollar bills were especially desirable and the only money used for campaign purposes?

A. I do. We had a working committee on the day of the election, composed of Republicans, who were to receive for the day's work at the polls \$2 each, and deemed it well to be prepared to pay that committee off soon after the election, and so provided myself with the proper change.

Q. Did you keep any account of the amounts paid out, and to the persons to whom paid, and the date of payment?

A. On the second night after the election I met with the committee that had that matter in charge, who had a list of the committee and who called the list, and as called I handed him \$2.

Q. How many names were on that list?

A. There were enough to exhaust the money.

This was not bribery!

"Perish the thought."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes to conclude.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CRAWFORD. My colleague [Mr. KITCHIN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS] have so fully answered the charges in other precincts I will not advert to them. At Harrells precinct, in Mitchell County, the judges of election adjourned without proceeding to count out as the law provides, and took the box to the home of a Republican, and the Republican judges began to count the ballots next morning before the Democratic judge arrived. This House has held time and again that a statute is mandatory when it requires the board to proceed with the count until completed without adjournment, that the "correctness of the count is an essential of the election." In the face of these decisions and the law of North Carolina, these ballots were not rejected but counted for contestant, giving him at that

box 167 majority. If this box had given me a majority the returns would have been rejected, I am sure. These investigations ought to be made in the spirit of fairness. Political bias ought not to control our judgment. This House has no power to elect, but to judge.

If the people make a mistake or commit a fraud in electing their Representative, this House can review and correct their mistake and prevent a miscarriage of justice; but if it should fail or refuse to fairly judge the case and put a man in who was not elected by a majority of the qualified voters, an irreparable wrong has been done, and the people are without a remedy.

The river Rhine, it is well known,
Doth wash the city of Cologne;
But tell me who, save power divine,
Can ever wash the river Rhine.

The ballot box is an institution in this country. It is the place where lawmakers are made and unmade. Destroy it and the people have no voice in government. Flanders says:

Without a dependence of the representative upon the electors, without a power on their part to call him to account for his conduct, the experiment of republican government will end in a despotism.

Now, gentlemen, I have concluded. I say to you that I would rather retire to private life and be forgotten by the people who have honored me than to climb to the summit of political power by slandering and traducing their good name. I would rather have the respect and confidence of the brave, honest, patriotic men of my district than all the glory that this House could confer by elevating me to a position which their free ballots had denied me.

I would a thousand times rather have my name erased from the public records of my country and obliterated from the memory of men than that one man in coming time should point the finger of scorn at my grave and say, "There lies a man who brought into disrepute the name of the people who had honored him." You have the case. Under the Constitution, you are both the court and the jury, and with the sanctity of an oath upon your consciences you will pass upon the law and the facts. I shall await your judgment, conscious that you can do me no harm in the good opinion of the people whose commission I hold. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. LINNEY. Mr. Speaker, this has got to be quite an interesting case, as are all cases touching the right to hold a seat on this floor. I fully agree with the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS] that it is a great wrong to place a man in a seat who is not elected to it. I also think that it is equally as great a wrong to retain a man in his seat who was not elected as it is to place one in who is a contestant and not elected. The proposition would be better stated in this way: That no man should occupy a seat in this House unless he has a clear title thereto. The returns, I concede, make out a prima facie case.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some things have been brought into this case that it seems to me should not have appeared on this floor. Whatever criticism may have been indulged in against the contestant in this case, or any of his methods, to my mind, sink into utter insignificance in comparison with that which seems to constitute the real foundation of the contestee's cause. I say that no court in the United States would have permitted the letter of Governor Russell to have been read upon this floor. When the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS] proposed to read it, at first I thought it was a joke. It would have taken a great deal more cheek than I possess—and I think I have a reasonable share of it—to have asked this grand tribunal to have heard an ex parte statement of a mad governor.

Why, Governor Russell is as mad as a wet hare—they say they sometimes do get mad. His hair is all the wrong way with him; and pray tell me what made it? That he is a great man there can be no question; but in politics, when he is in harness—in the ranks—he is a good Republican; but he is one of those men that can not stand promotion. The very moment you promote him he gets beyond his faith and kicks out of the harness and plays the devil in general. [Laughter.] That is his excellency Daniel L. Russell.

Now, let me show you what is the matter with Governor Russell. Here is a set of resolutions drawn by Mr. Pearson, it is said. I take it they are, because it is a scholarly production. Now, these resolutions do not mention the name of Governor Daniel L. Russell. Up to that time Governor Russell had never prepared the document upon which the contestee relies in this case for his vindication. So that it seems this remarkable document of the governor, prepared and sent here the very hour that this great court was to enter upon this trial, must have had its origin from some secret purpose of the governor unknown to this House.

Here are the resolutions; they indorse the President, but do not indorse Governor Russell; hence this document of Governor Russell—inspired, I fear, by some hatred against Pearson, because Pearson did not recognize Russell as being a great Republican and a great man. He has been a great Republican and a great

man. But now he is afraid of his shadow; he is afraid of the Democratic organization in that State, and therefore will do anything to please them in order to keep the suspended sword that hangs over him to-day from falling upon him and cutting off his official head.

Gentlemen, even with that paper, it seems to me the contestee's case amounts to but little. Let me read a part of it which the gentleman who read it yesterday failed to emphasize:

Here we are in North Carolina—

Says Governor Russell—

charging truthfully that the Democrats are sweeping things by force and fraud; that they have put upon us an election law that is meaner than the Goebel devilry; and Mr. Pearson schemes to get himself at the head of the platform committee in the State convention, fixes the resolutions, and reads a platform before the convention denouncing fraud and demanding honesty.

What comfort is there for the contestee in this document, if it is to be considered as evidence, when it charges the Democracy of North Carolina with being engaged in a war against the rights of the people—an assault upon the ballot box? That also appears in this document and, it seems to me, ought to be considered as well as the balance of it. The truth is none of it should be considered. It is not evidence.

Suppose the distinguished gentleman from Indiana had a civil suit in a court of justice and the governor of the State or an editor of the county of any influence at all had written a letter of that sort the day before the trial; would he not have felt it his duty to file an affidavit for the removal of his client's cause to a section where he could get a fair trial?

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I would like to remove this cause to any kind of a forum, if I could.

Mr. LINNEY. Yes, I have no doubt you would like to remove this cause to any kind of a forum and hold on to the stolen goods. [Laughter.] But at last you have got to a place where you can not run any farther with these ill-gotten goods.

The gentleman does not answer my question. I say there is not a lawyer who commands the respect of the people of any county in these United States who would not feel it his duty to file an affidavit to remove his case from any county where even an editor, much less the governor, had on the very eve of the trial hurled before the popular mind a letter prejudicial in the extreme to his client's cause.

I have seen causes removed upon less grounds a hundred times. I know nothing within the sweep of my imagination to equal the crookedness, the irregularity, and the direct wrong to the contestee in this case by such a proceeding, except, possibly, it be the course of the contestee touching the law upon the subject of the two cases in North Carolina which were decided against the Republicans and in favor of the Democrats, and the attempt now to force upon this House a construction of that statute totally different from that put upon it by the senate of the State of North Carolina when the Democrats were to be the beneficiaries thereby.

But, Mr. Speaker, some things have been said in this case that I will not allow to go unnoticed. The most remarkable among them is the position taken by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. Why he should take that position I do not know. What effect it is to have in this case I can not see, unless it is to prejudice the minds of the people of this great Republic against the white Republicans of North Carolina. I propose to read a part of the language of the gentleman. His speech does not appear in the RECORD to-day, but I have obtained a copy of the stenographer's notes and have them here. Here is what the gentleman said:

Every gentleman on this floor who is acquainted with Southern conditions knows that where you have a county anywhere in the South in which the negroes constitute a considerable portion of the voting population—say 20 or 25 per cent or more than that, and the proportion is about 20 per cent in that county of Buncombe—there you find the negroes lining up almost solidly on one side for the Republican party; and there, Mr. Speaker, you find the overwhelming majority of the virtue and intelligence of the white race lining up almost solidly on the other side.

That is the statement thrown in here by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, for a purpose, I suppose, but what I can not imagine, unless it is his design to prejudice the white Republicans of North Carolina. Now, I undertake to say to the gentleman who is attempting to pose on this floor as the representative of the white man's party—I undertake to say in this place and before the American people that the records here show that the Democratic party in North Carolina is the enemy of the white man and that the Republican party is his friend.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having made this statement, it is my duty to prove it, and I shall proceed to do so in as brief a manner as I possibly can. I would not be worthy of a seat on the floor of this House if I could not prove the statement I have made. I will call your attention, therefore, to the figures which come from official sources. I went to the Census Office and there I got the figures which I propose to use in this discussion for the purpose of demonstrating mathematically and absolutely that the gentleman from North Carolina, my distinguished colleague [Mr. KITCHIN], represents more negroes than white men in the Democratic party—

that is to say, that counties in which his support is to be found contains more negroes than whites, deducting therefrom the white men that vote the Republican ticket.

Now, gentlemen, I beg you to pay particular attention to the points that I am going to present to you. I am going to try and support what I have said or will say by the figures, and want to show you the condition of the population in this part of the State of North Carolina from which this election contest comes. Mr. Pearson, the contestant in this case, and myself have represented two districts in North Carolina for a number of years—the Eighth and the Ninth districts. In those districts there is perhaps a smaller proportion of negro votes than in any other district of the State. They comprise 26 counties, about one-third of the area of the State of North Carolina. Now, what do the figures show in this connection?

Now, come to my district, and let us see what has been done in reference to the votes there. It is overwhelmingly white. I represent a white district. I am a white man—my hands and feet are smaller than almost any gentleman's on the other side, and my complexion as clear as his. [Laughter.] Besides that, Mr. Speaker, there are more white people to support me than he had. Let me prove that assertion. Here is a statement I have received from authentic sources showing the white and colored population of his district.

According to the last census the Fifth Congressional district of North Carolina had 68,102 colored people and 109,721 whites.

	Votes.
Kitchin received.....	20,869
Adams received.....	18,607

Kitchin's majority.....	2,261
-------------------------	-------

I understand the gentleman was born in Halifax County. The census of 1890, page 400, Part I, of Population, shows that Halifax County has 9,614 whites and 19,293 colored population.

We have before us the result of this election. We have the official returns of Halifax County. And yet what do we find? A county having over two negroes to one white gives the Democrats a majority of 1,009 votes. Now, if these people are to be deprived of their rights as citizens, and their votes taken from the Republican column by fraud and placed to the Democratic column, every vote so transferred kills a white vote in the west.

Mr. KITCHIN (interrupting). Will the gentleman from North Carolina permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LINNEY. Why, certainly; with pleasure.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman undertakes to submit an argument that a large proportion of the population in the State of North Carolina—I refer now to the colored voters—living in the Second district were disfranchised at this election. Halifax County, as the gentleman knows, is in the Second district, and is not in my district. The district under discussion in this contest is the Ninth, 300 miles from Halifax. As to my statement quoted, the gentleman from Massachusetts had referred to the fact that Mr. Crawford carried Buncombe County, and in explaining it I referred to the fact that in Buncombe County, in this Ninth district, the negroes form 20 per cent of the voting population and the whites 80 per cent, and that there Mr. Crawford got a majority, as the Democrats usually carry counties with white majorities yet with a large negro population.

That was my argument, but I have no hesitation in saying that in those large negro counties where you have comparatively no white Republicans, as the gentleman knows—of course there are a few, a sprinkling, but comparatively none—that there were found this great mass of impressionable voters, composed largely of ignorant negroes. I admit that there, the Democracy composing the vast majority of intelligence and responsibility in those counties, the Democrats frequently carry those counties by a large majority.

Mr. LINNEY. Do the negroes vote for them, or do they steal them? Now answer me like a man. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. I will answer the gentleman. I do not live in that black belt. I live in a district that is overwhelmingly white in its population. I was raised in the district known as the black district of North Carolina. Frequently the Democratic politicians there, by one means or another, sometimes by dividing the opposition—

Mr. LINNEY. Do not take all of my time, my friend.

Mr. KITCHIN. Did you not ask me to answer your question?

Mr. LINNEY. Yes; but do not put a speech into it.

Mr. KITCHIN. They frequently divide the opposition, because there the only principle known to the Republican party is the principle of office, the five loaves and the two fishes; usually in those black counties I mean, not always. Then they use money. I know they are sometimes charged with buying the negro leaders; but in one way and another they carry those coun-

ties, and they go Democratic. I have no personal acquaintance with the means or methods.

Mr. LINNEY. I did not yield for a speech, my friend.

Mr. KITCHIN. You asked me to explain how these counties went Democratic.

Mr. LINNEY. I asked you a plain question, to be answered yes or no, and you are trying to put a speech into mine, without improving mine and hurting yours, it seems to me. [Laughter.] Now, I will not yield any further on that. I may on something else.

Mr. KITCHIN. You asked me whether these votes were cast by the negroes for the Democrats, or whether they were stolen. I was explaining to you how those counties could go Democratic without either the negroes voting the Democratic ticket or the votes being stolen.

Mr. LINNEY. The gentleman does not contend that they were not stolen, and he has made an argument from which the conclusion necessarily follows that they are stolen. What is that argument? Here it is: That wherever 20 per cent of negroes are found, there they vote the Republican ticket. Here I find two negroes to one white man, and yet you carry it by 1,009 votes. Then, the conclusion follows necessarily, just as much so as that twice two make four, that you stole a thousand votes. Or, I will withdraw the word "stole" if the gentleman desires it, and say that for the righteous purpose of the Democratic organization you righteously appropriated or misappropriated that many votes. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Just one moment.

Mr. LINNEY. No; no more on that. You had two hours and I have had none.

Mr. KITCHIN. I understood that you made a kind of personal request to me.

Mr. LINNEY. No; I have made no personal assault on you, and I am not going to.

Mr. KITCHIN. I wish to call attention to the fact that the gentleman is arguing about conditions 300 miles removed from the district in this case, this district having only 10 per cent of negroes in it.

Mr. LINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. LINNEY. Here is the proposition they make, here is the accusation which they hurl against us, which I do not intend shall pass in this great Republic without being challenged. They claim to be the white man's party in North Carolina, when they are not, and when the Republican party is truly the party of the white man. Now, let me see, if they did steal these thousand votes, as the reasoning of the gentleman's argument necessarily shows they did, what is the result?

If the negroes all vote the Republican ticket where they constitute 20 per cent of the population, as the distinguished gentleman [Mr. KITCHIN] contended yesterday, then you are engaged in a process of wholesale slaughter against your white brethren in the West, because if the negroes want to vote the Republican ticket, as the gentleman yesterday said they did, every negro vote you take from the Republican column in the East and put on the Democratic side is two votes for the Democrats, when they did not get any; and in that way the Democracy has a great dagger concealed about its person somewhere, and while professing friendship to the white man and professing to be the representative of the white man it cuts out the political vitals of every white man that it can reach, not by fair methods, but by stealing the negro vote and taking it from one column and putting it in the other.

Yet the gentleman claims the Democracy is the party of the white man. I deny it, and it shall not go unchallenged on the floor of this House. Mr. Speaker, no proposition should be stated here that is not founded on truth. Mr. Dodd, the greatest writer that I have ever read, says no one has the right to take a position that is not supported by that true word which knows no deception, except it is to quiet the weeping of a little baby in its colic. [Laughter.]

That is all the exception there is to it; and when a man attempts to carry out a great cause by the employment of deception he does it by the purchase of a sword that destroys the arm that is to wield it. So, I say here, when the country understands this properly you will understand all this negro hunting of the South and these laws enacted unconstitutionally and by revolutionary means are dangerous in the extreme. Every man who has the sense of a well-educated rabbit must know it will be followed with the bloodshed and destruction of my people.

They have their origin in prejudice and their paths are marked with crime, as shown by these figures, ten times worse than any thing ever charged against the Republicans. Why, the idea of you claiming to be the representative of the white man in this House! You are his enemy, and you have behind you the negro; and instead of abusing him and cussing him, you ought to treat him as you do on election day—kiss him instead of cussing him

out—for his vote by your wrong inures to your benefit. [Laughter.]

The gentleman said yesterday that "the strange woman said that stolen waters are sweet." It is a fact you steal a thousand votes from the negroes in the county of Halifax. I ask you whether the harlot in Halifax, the Democratic harlot, sustains the idea presented in the Bible "that stolen waters are sweet;" because if there ever was evidence of the outrage of the ballot box it is in these figures. No amount of human ingenuity can hide, no amount of individual force can possibly justify this iniquity. The best men of North Carolina have at times risen up against these abuses. Your father, one of the ablest men I ever heard, denounced the iniquitous methods, claiming they produced bloodshed and ruin if they were insisted upon in North Carolina.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having noticed that, I want to call attention to matters connected directly with this case. I would not have gone into these matters at all if they had not been discussed upon the floor and presented outside of the record. Mr. Pearson received in the year 1896 1,300 majority in this white district, where the gentleman admits there are not many negroes, as far as that is concerned.

Now, at the next election Mr. Pearson is defeated, they claim, by 238 majority, and the question arises, What had taken place to produce that effect in North Carolina? What had taken place to produce the impression upon the public mind? For, gentlemen of the House, influences were in operation in North Carolina, I undertake to say, that the wit of man had never before devised. What were they? Let me call the attention to some. "Red shirts" were inaugurated in the State of North Carolina. Men were shot down. The governor of the State could not give an address to the people in a city there.

Your Senator, as splendid a representative of moral, intellectual, and physical manhood as North Carolina has ever sent to the Senate of the United States, had an intimation, and your candidate for governor this day has proclaimed it from the stump, that neither the governor nor neither one of the Senators could go to Wilmington. You know that. Every man that reads the papers knows it. Was there ever such a state of affairs before? What else? The Republican ticket at Wilmington was forced to come down to prevent bloodshed, and it came down. Had ever anything of that sort been done in the State?

Now, what is the argument? PRITCHARD could not go to Wilmington, Russell could not go to Wilmington, BUTLER could not go to Wilmington. They purchased thousands of arms, and men were killed in Wilmington thereby. That is all counted against the Republican party. Was PRITCHARD afraid of the Republicans? Was BUTLER afraid of the Populists? Was Russell afraid? Had the Republicans bought guns and worn red shirts—had Republicans slain men? Nay, verily, not one. There never has been a place in North Carolina where a Democrat could not go to the polls and deposit his ballot and have it counted as cast.

Thank God that much can be said of the Republican party in North Carolina, and I believe all over the United States! Now, what is this argument—this argument of the Democrats? It is simply this: Suppose I go to a man's smokehouse to-night with my pistol drawn. I want his bacon, and he rises up and draws his on me and says, "You shall not have it." On the idea of the North Carolina proposition I am to suppress the owner of the smokehouse in order to have peace. That is exactly the argument they are now having and suppressing that vote in North Carolina by our laws. They do not use that language, but that is the argument. These conditions, as I say, have this effect upon the popular mind.

Suppose you take a lake the size of this House and you throw a pebble into the water. See how quickly it disturbs the surface. Suppose you throw a stone a thousand pounds in weight; it disturbs it still more. Suppose you throw a great weight of infamy and unfairness into it; the disturbance will be deep and strong, and it causes the placid waters of the lake to be thrown into waves and they become turbulent and disturbed over the entire lake.

So I say that the effect of TILLMAN coming down to North Carolina and proclaiming that shotguns are worth more than votes, and another great man declaring that we will stop the Cape Fear River with dead carcasses before we shall fail—these things were like throwing millstones into this placid lake, and it disturbed and put the entire lake, through the entire State—calling North Carolina a lake—into trouble and confusion; and such confusion as has prejudiced the Republican cause throughout the State; and there is evidence here showing it. So that there were things that happened after the election of 1896.

Let me go a step further, gentlemen of the House. Here we have in this case the returns of the election officers, and these returns, if I recollect right, give the contestee 238 majority. The first question to be determined is, Are these returns true? The presumption is that they are. I will argue it as a lawyer, as near

as I can. That is the presumption, and Mr. Pearson must show that they are not true.

Now, gentlemen of the House, I say that it is admitted in this House that these returns are not true. Why do I say it? In the argument it is said that on a recount it was found that Crawford had been given 10 more votes at one place than he was entitled to; I think 10 more than was cast; at any rate, 10 more than he was entitled to. But they say it is pettifoggery to talk about that. Let me say this: Suppose this involved the validity of a deed, a fraudulent sale, and you had to find that \$228 was the price given for the land, and it could be shown by the creditor that \$20 of that money was the money of the alleged fraudulent grantor. What would be the effect of it?

I address myself to every lawyer upon this floor. Is there a lawyer or a judge in the United States but who would say that the very moment you prove that there are \$20 of fraudulent money that went into that consideration—yes, one dollar—under the statute of Elizabeth, it not only shakes, but it destroys the conveyance, and the creditor gets it.

Now, here are these returns assailed, as they admit; a mistake of 10. What else? They go on then to investigate. Mark you, they deny that there was any mistake; deny any wrong. They go on to investigate and find in another precinct, when they wanted to make out the election returns, they gave Mr. Pearson Crawford's vote and gave Crawford Pearson's vote, exactly reversing the result, to the detriment of Pearson of 10 votes. Now, add the two, and you will find these returns successfully assailed to that extent. Assailed how? By the proof of wrong. The contestee denied it, and the contestant alleged that it was so. That being so, these returns are shaken; their integrity has been properly assailed—not enough to destroy the entire returns; I am not claiming that. But they are assailed successfully.

Now, gentlemen, when the returns are assailed, and proved not to be true, the foundation upon which the contestee's case rests has been shaken, has been weakened, and it does not require the same amount of proof to overthrow it as it would if the returns themselves had been shown to be absolutely true. Well, that is one defect in it. Let us go to another. Here is one matter that settles it if I am right on the law. Turn to page 4 of the majority report.

The defect in the registry at South Waynesville, in Haywood County, and at Marble, in Cherokee County, as to the place of registration, is proved by the testimony of contestee's own witnesses, W. H. Faucett, record, page 12, and J. C. Anderson, record, page 206. They swear that the registration took place at a place other than that designated by law. Now, gentlemen, what is the effect of that? I once said, as Brother KITCHIN argued the other day, that these statutes were mandatory.

I brought the suit of Quinn against Latimer. The Democrats in North Carolina had stolen, or appropriated—if gentlemen prefer that—the offices to which the Populists and Republicans of North Carolina had been elected. I found they had thrown out one precinct entire, and a great many votes out of others. I brought quo warranto to try the title. It went to the supreme court, and the supreme court decided that the statutes were not mandatory, but directory, and the fraudulent Democratic usurpers were hurled from power and the Republicans put in. What happened afterwards? After that the legislature repealed that statute and passed another. Then what? An election was held under that very statute. Two Republicans from the grand old county of Mitchell were elected, and they got certificates. They went and presented their certificates and took their seats.

The Democrats happened to have a majority. There was a member there by the name of Campbell, a good man. He concluded, as the gentleman now argues, that the statute was directly not mandatory. He went before the senate; and here is the argument of the attorney-general, a Democrat, concurred in by two other senators. Osborne and Mike Justice and Glenn—they did not all speak, but they were there and concurred in this opinion—gave it as their opinion that this new statute was mandatory.

Now, who is Osborne? Who is Bob Glenn? And who is Mike Justice? If the Democracy of North Carolina is a trinity, these three men are the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost of that trinity, and gentlemen from my State know it. They rank to-day among the best lawyers of the State. These three men gave it as their opinion that this statute was mandatory, and in pursuance of that construction of the statutes they proceeded to throw out two Republican senators and put in two Democratic senators.

The argument of my brother KITCHIN leads necessarily to this conclusion—that those men took these offices by force, took them without authority of law, and have been holding them unlawfully ever since, participating in the legislation of that legislature, which is yet in existence, which will meet again in June. I ask the gentleman whether he has ever protested against it? If so, when, where, and how? They have held those positions and are still holding them. It never happened before, I presume, in the

history of the world—I am satisfied it never happened in the history of this Republic—that a Democratic member of Congress here in his place admitted that his party associates had committed a wrong.

Mr. KITCHIN. What is your allegation?

Mr. LINNEY. It is that you admitted that the senate of North Carolina did wrong in throwing out those Republican members, did you not?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think so.

Mr. LINNEY. The gentleman now admits it, but he never admitted it before. He never made a speech in North Carolina condemning it; he never went to his associates and said to them, "My brethren, you are doing wrong." But he went along with them and stayed with them.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will ask the gentleman what he thinks about it. Does he think that those men were properly thrown out or not?

Mr. LINNEY. I think this about it, that the law was decided by that body to be mandatory—

Mr. KITCHIN. Answer yes or no.

Mr. LINNEY. And I take it that the law being mandatory they were properly thrown out.

Mr. KITCHIN. Do you take the position that they were properly thrown out?

Mr. LINNEY. Under the construction given by them to the law, I do.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am not asking their construction of the law, but your construction.

Mr. LINNEY. You are not going to get my opinion of the law in the face of this trinity that I have spoken of.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman can not answer the question candidly.

Mr. LINNEY. Candor coming from you is like prayer coming from a sinner. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, those two senators were placed in that position; they were placed there upon the construction of the law—not under the old statute, but under a new statute. And as I understand the law of elections, it is this: That where there is a regular drift of cases, a regular line of decisions or State authorities all one way, it is the duty of Congress to stand by that line. But I understand that where there has been a diversity of ruling, Congress, disregarding the precedents, must do what it thinks right. In this contest, if brother Crawford or his associates became the beneficiaries of that act, of that construction of the act, they are now estopped by every principle of equity from denying it.

But what, my dear brother, will those men say when they learn that upon the floor of this House you have admitted that their action was wrong? If you honestly believe so, it is your duty like a man to say so. But in trying this case it is right for us to apply the principles of law; and whatever you may say about the statute, or whatever I may say about it, if the decisions have been conflicting it is our duty to adopt our own construction of the law. By doing that we apply the rule, "What is good for the goose is good for the gander." [Laughter.]

If those two Republicans up there in Mitchell County had been thrown out, then the same rule comes back to be applied to Mr. Crawford. It comes back by legal construction. It comes back, according to the Democratic argument now, as the result of what I said and establishes the position taken by that minister who is now gone, that no man on any proposition can afford to take a position that is not true; that if he does he purchases a sword at the sacrifice of the arm that is to wield it.

Now, if we apply the ruling to this case, what is the effect? Let us see. Without anything else being done, we put Pearson in by a plurality of 2 votes, without touching any of the rest of the case at all.

What else, Mr. Speaker? Let us see what else is covered by this controversy. My brother Mr. Crawford, the contestee in this case, who made a fine argument, exceedingly creditable to himself and to his State, because I am proud of it as a North Carolinian, as I am always proud of anything creditable that comes from my State—has made an argument on this particular point that I do not believe on reflection he will be willing to stand by. He has referred to a certain part of the testimony here, and I ask his attention especially to that, because in his argument he ridiculed the idea of the contention, as to the ballot box at South Waynesville—I think that was the point to which he referred—that it should be thrown out because the election officers did not "cleanse the boxes," as is provided by the law of our State.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are some provisions of the law in reference to elections which are mandatory. There are certain provisions relating to elections which, if not strictly complied with, render the election null and void—for instance, the fixing of the time and place of holding the election and the size of the ballots

which are used in the election. There are also certain mandatory provisions under the law as applicable to all elections.

There are, for instance, mandatory provisions of the law which apply to the election officers. Judge Cooley, in the Law of Elections, McCrary, and other writers all unite in the expression of an opinion that certain things in election laws are mandatory. For instance, if it is provided in the law that the ballots shall be written upon a particular kind of paper, or of a peculiar color, and of a fixed size, that is mandatory upon the officers of election, and they have no right to count other ballots which do not conform with the law in that regard. If, for instance, the law provides that the ballots shall be written upon white paper, and they shall be written on yellow paper, then the ballots should not be received.

In our State the law provides that the ballots shall be printed upon white paper. It also provides that the ballot box shall be of such a size, and also provision is made that the officers of election shall "cleanse the ballot box," in accordance with the statute—a mandatory provision—which refers to throwing out old ballots that may have been in the box, and which mandate must be obeyed. There is no escape from this provision of the law.

Now, what is the condition that we find in this election contest? When we came to this particular box, to which my friend Mr. Crawford has adverted, and which is very important in connection with his contest, they found that 300 tickets were in it, most of them old tickets, and it became a matter of some difficulty to determine which were the old tickets and which were the new ones. In other words, the ballot box had not been "cleansed" according to law, and I maintain that the claim of the contestant in connection with the ballots in that precinct is a sound one and can not be defeated on legal grounds.

You may put your ticket, when you cast your vote, in a bag or a box or a gourd, but the law requires that this bag or this box or gourd must be cleansed as commanded in the statute; you must see that the ticket is of the right size and that the election is held in the proper place, fixed by law, or otherwise you can discredit the ballot of a sovereign citizen who is entitled to vote. But what is the case here? Is the provision of the statute of the State of North Carolina complied with in this election? If a ticket is presented at an election which does not conform in every respect to the law—without reference to whom it may be cast for—would any honest election officer receive it, or would it not be rejected altogether as contrary to the law? Would you yourself not vote to reject such tickets?

Now, take a ballot box with 300 old ballots in it, and then go right along voting on top of them, packing them in, almost ramming them in with a ramrod, and then say that that is the kind of receptacle in a legal sense that the electors were entitled to have! I say it is the presentation of a proposition that shocks common intelligence, shocks the common intelligence of every lawyer who is worthy of the name, and that that precinct ought to be thrown out.

In throwing it out the parties are not necessarily deprived of their vote. They can resort to aliunde proof. Here they did not do it. Pearson did not resort to any; Crawford did not resort to any. What is the result? It is the case of an abortion, if you will allow the expression, and the whole thing goes out. Neither one is counted anything. It goes out as the result of a legal inference, and it contains nothing that is absolutely disreputable either to Crawford or to Pearson. It is the voice of the law, which is greater and stronger than Pearson or Crawford or anyone else. So out goes that.

Now, what else? Let us take another precinct—Black Mountain precinct, for instance. When you come to that precinct, what do you find? Four witnesses swear that a judge of election there placed his hands in the box—it may be that only two of them swear to it, I am speaking from recollection—they swear that they saw him pull tickets out of the box with his right hand and pull tickets out of his pocket with the other hand, and take the ticket that came out of his pocket and cry out "Crawford" or "Pearson," whichever it may be. The ballots counted were taken from his pocket, and the ballots taken by the right hand were those which came from the box. It is true the most of the witnesses testify—

Mr. KITCHIN. There is no evidence whatever of that.

Mr. LINNEY. You have had your say. I am stating my say.

Mr. KITCHIN. There is no evidence of that.

Mr. LINNEY. I understand you do not think there is any evidence about it at all.

Mr. KITCHIN. Not about any such thing as that.

Mr. LINNEY. I say there was evidence; and if you gentlemen will read it you will find it. One man—a Democrat, too—testified that at one time this judge of election was at the Congressional box. Mr. Crawford's contention is that this happened at the county box; but one witness testified that it was at the Congressional box. I do not care where it was, gentlemen of this House,

If you have a judge of election performing in that way at an election precinct, I do not care who he is or whether he has the blood of a king in his veins or the blood of a peasant, you have a most dangerous instrumentality supervising and governing it, and the only thing you can do is to throw it out. So I think that ought to go out.

Then what else? There are other precincts in the same fix; only worse off, if possible. Take Limestone precinct. The committee find that—

The returns from this precinct must be rejected, because the proof of bribery is clear and conclusive and taints the whole poll, so that it is impossible to purge the poll of the illegal votes. The testimony of J. H. Sumner, James Webb, and Paton Durham, of which extracts are given below, make this perfectly clear.

Well, I do not say it is perfectly clear, but I say there is evidence of it, and I say there is a preponderance of evidence; and I say, furthermore, that the triers of election cases should see to it that the hand of bribery corrupteth nothing. Why, if you will examine the authorities, they are so careful against that that one of them says where A was a candidate for register of deeds and he promised the people that he would cut down the fees one-half, the court held that that was bribery, that anything mercenary which operates upon the mind of the voter is bribery, and vitiates the vote so that it can not be counted.

This committee have found these facts. The finding of a committee ought to have weight with this body. It is like the finding of a referee in a chancery cause. Where the cause goes to a referee, the referee finds the facts, and then the court pronounces judgment upon those facts. Now, I see my time is about out. I claim that the findings of fact by the majority have the force and effect of the findings of fact of a referee, which a judge will not review unless they are clearly against the weight of testimony.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken longer than I intended. Other matters have been discussed and gone over in this controversy. I think the preponderance of evidence establishes the contention of Mr. Pearson, not by an overwhelming majority—I do not claim that—but I say that in my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of any man who will carefully investigate it, taking all the circumstances surrounding this case into consideration—and circumstantial evidence in an election case is just as much entitled to weight as it is in a murder case or any other trial—I say the preponderance of evidence is in favor of the contestant in this case.

Taking into consideration all this, these circumstances—witnesses that could not be bought with bribery and could not be touched, that could not be frightened in connection with all the testimony of the witnesses that the contestee was able to produce to the contrary—make out a clear case by a preponderance of evidence that Pearson was elected by about a hundred majority. Believing that, it will be the duty of this House under these facts, in my humble judgment, to adopt the resolutions of the majority.

In doing so, gentlemen of the House, great good has been accomplished. If Pearson was elected and the contestee was not elected, you correct a great evil. You not only correct a great evil, but you send forth from this high place that this great court—a court as much governed by law as any other court—that a man not elected can not come into this great place and hold a position not sustained by a majority of the regular, legally qualified electors of the district from which he came. I will not take any more of the time of the House. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I propose only to make a short statement, not in the way of argument upon the question, and then move the previous question. The statement I wish to make is this: The contestee, in his address to the House, said—

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBERTS (continuing). That two Republicans on the committee—

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I would like to ask the gentleman—

Mr. ROBERTS (continuing). Were against the contestant.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana rises to a point of order, which he will please state.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I would like to inquire, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is in order in making an argument in connection with moving the previous question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not asked the previous question.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I would like to ask how much time that side of the House has occupied?

The SPEAKER. The side of the gentleman from Indiana has had three hours and fifty-four minutes and the other side three hours and forty-six minutes.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. The gentleman has occupied fully two hours.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right to close debate.

Mr. ROBERTS. Then we have eight minutes on this side. Am I right?

The SPEAKER. There is no time limited for the previous question to be ordered by the House. The Chair had merely stated what had been the division of the time.

Mr. ROBERTS. I understand I am recognized in my own right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right to close debate.

Mr. ROBERTS. I said that I did not intend to go into any argument on the case, but merely to refute one statement made by the contestee in his address to the House, a statement made by him in these words:

I want to call attention of gentlemen of this House to the fact that the subcommittee who had this case under consideration reported back in my favor.

Mr. BARTLETT. Two Republicans and one Democrat.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Two Republicans and one Democrat constituted the subcommittee to which this case was referred.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. You state that two Republicans and one Democrat reported against the contestant?

Mr. CRAWFORD. They were against the contestant when they got back to the full committee.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Can you give the names of those two Republicans?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, I can give the names.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Who were they?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. DRISCOLL, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. MIERS of Indiana.

I want to deny absolutely and utterly that I at any time, in committee or out of it, was against the contestant. And I have never known that Mr. DRISCOLL, my Republican colleague, at any time has reported back to the committee against Mr. Pearson.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Will you deny that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DRISCOLL] is against the contestant, and holds that he was not entitled to his seat? Will you deny that fact?

Mr. ROBERTS. I do not know what is the mind of the gentleman from New York. The roll call will disclose his attitude. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What I meant to say was that two of the three committeemen who were on that subcommittee were in favor of me as a subcommittee, and in making the report—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I do not think that is any question of personal privilege.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I hope the gentleman will withdraw until I make myself understood by the House.

Mr. ROBERTS. I withdraw the demand for the previous question for the moment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I never claimed that the gentleman from Massachusetts was for me. It may have been an unhappy use of language, but I never suggested he was for me.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute resolutions offered by the minority.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I call for the yeas and nays direct.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of adopting the substitute will vote aye and those opposed will vote no, and the Chair desires to state that if gentlemen will observe order it will expedite the call.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolutions we are to vote upon be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the minority resolutions will be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Richmond Pearson was not elected a Representative from the Ninth district of North Carolina to the Fifty-sixth Congress.

Resolved, That William T. Crawford was duly elected, and is entitled to retain his seat.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 127, nays 128, answered "present" 11, not voting 86; as follows:

YEAS—127.

Adamson,	Brenner,	Cummings,	Fitzgerald, N. Y.
Allen, Ky.	Brewer,	Davenport, S. W.	Foster,
Atwater,	Brundidge,	Davey,	Gaston,
Bailey, Tex.	Burleson,	Davis,	Gayle,
Ball,	Burnett,	De Armond,	Gilbert,
Bankhead,	Caldwell,	De Graffenreid,	Glynn,
Barber,	Campbell,	De Vries,	Gordon,
Bartlett,	Chanler,	Denny,	Green, Pa.
Bell,	Clark, Mo.	Dinsmore,	Griggs,
Bellamy,	Clayton, Ala.	Dougherty,	Hay,
Benton,	Cooney,	Driggs,	Henry, Miss.
Bradley,	Cowherd,	Elliott,	Howard,
Brantley,	Cox,	Finley,	Jack,
Breazeale,	Crowley,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	Johnston,

Jones, Va. King. Kieberg, Kluttz, Lamb, Lanham, Lassiter, Latimer, Lentz, Lester, Little, Livingston, Lloyd, McClellan, McCulloch, McLain, McRae,	Maddox, May, Meekison, Miers, Ind. Moon, Muller, Neville, Norton, Ohio Norton, S. C. Otey, Polk, Quarles, Ransdell, Rhea, Ky. Rhea, Va. Richardson, Riordan, Rixey,	Robinson, Ind. Robinson, Nebr. Rucker, Ruppert, Ryan, N. Y. Ryan, Pa. Salmon, Scudder, Shackleford, Sheppard, Sibley, Slayden, Small, Sparkman, Spight, Stallings, Stark, Stephens, Tex.	Stokes, Sulzer, Swanson, Talbert, Terry, Thayer, Thomas, N. C. Turner, Underhill, Underwood, Vandiver, Williams, J. R. Williams, W. E. Williams, Miss. Wilson, Idaho Wilson, N. Y. Ziegler.
---	--	---	---

NAYS—128.

Acheson, Aldrich, Alexander, Allen, Me. Babcock, Bailey, Kans. Baker, Barham, Barney, Bingham, Bishop, Boutell, Ill. Bowersock, Brick, Brosius, Brown, Burke, S. Dak. Burkett, Burleigh, Burton, Butler, Cannon, Capron, Clarke, N. H. Connell, Corliss, Cromer, Crump, Crumpacker, Curtis, Cushman, Dahle, Wis.	Dalzell, Davenport, S. A. Davidson, Dayton, Dick, Eddy, Emerson, Esch, Fordney, Foss, Fowler, Freer, Gamble, Gardner, Mich. Gardner, N. J. Gill, Gillett, N. Y. Gillett, Mass. Graft, Graham, Greene, Mass. Grosvenor, Grout, Grow, Hamilton, Haugen, Hedge, Hemenway, Hill, Hitt, Hoffecker, Howell,	Hull, Jones, Wash. Joy, Kahn, Landis, Lawrence, Linney, Littauer, Littlefield, Long, Loud, Loudenslager, Lybrand, McCleary, McPherson, Mahon, Marsh, Mercer, Minor, Mondell, Moody, Mass. Moody, Oreg. Morris, Mudd, O'Grady, Olmsted, Otjen, Overstreet, Packer, Pa. Parker, N. J. Payne, Pearce, Mo.	Pearre, Powers, Ray, Reeder, Roberts, Russell, Shattuc, Shelden, Smith, H. C. Southard, Sperry, Sprague, Steele, Stewart, N. J. Stewart, N. Y. Stewart, Wis. Sulloway, Tawney, Taylor, Ohio Thropp, Van Voorhis, Vreeland, Wachter, Wadsworth, Wanger, Waters, Watson, Weaver, Weeks, White, Wise, Young.
---	--	---	--

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—11.

Bromwell, Brownlow, Gibson,	Griffith, Jenkins, Jett,	Miller, Needham, Pugh,	Wheeler, Ky. Wright.
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------

NOT VOTING—86.

Adams, Allen, Miss. Bartholdt, Berry, Boreing, Boutelle, Me. Broussard, Bull, Burke, Tex. Calderhead, Carmack, Catchings, Clayton, N. Y. Cochran, Mo. Cochrane, N. Y. Cooper, Tex. Cooper, Wis. Cousins, Crawford, Cusack, Daly, N. J. Dolliver,	Dovener, Driscoll, Faris, Fitzpatrick, Fleming, Fletcher, Fox, Gaines, Hall, Hawley, Heatwole, Henry, Conn. Henry, Tex. Hepburn, Hopkins, Kerr, Ketcham, Knox, Lacey, Lane, Levy, Lewis,	Lorimer, Lovering, McAleer, McCall, McDowell, Mann, Mesick, Metcalf, Meyer, La. Morgan, Naphen, Newlands, Noonan, Pierce, Tenn. Phillips, Prince, Reeves, Ridgely, Robb, Robertson, La. Rodenberg, Shafroth,	Sherman, Showalter, Sims, Smith, Ill. Smith, Ky. Smith, Samuel W. Smith, Wm. Alden Snodgrass, Spalding, Stevens, Minn. Sutherland, Tate, Taylor, Ala. Thomas, Iowa Tompkins, Tongue, Warner, Weymouth, Wilson, S. C. Zenor.
---	---	---	--

So the adoption of the substitute resolutions was not agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. HAWLEY with Mr. COOPER of Texas.
Mr. MESICK with Mr. BURKE of Texas.
Mr. BROMWELL with Mr. McDOWELL.
Mr. MANN with Mr. JETT.
Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. HALL.
Mr. REEVES with Mr. NOONAN.
Mr. SPALDING with FLEMING.
Mr. CALDERHEAD with Mr. SHAFROTH.
Mr. LACEY with Mr. LEWIS.
Mr. BROWNLOW with Mr. CARMACK.
Mr. KNOX with Mr. HENRY of Texas.
Mr. LORIMER with Mr. CUSACK.
Mr. MCCALL with Mr. GAINES.
Mr. DOLLIVER with Mr. ROBB.
Mr. WEYMOUTH with Mr. BROUSSARD.
Mr. BOREING with Mr. FITZPATRICK.
Mr. DOVENER with Mr. CATCHINGS.
Mr. GIBSON with Mr. SIMS.
Mr. PRINCE with Mr. GRIFFITH.
Mr. FLETCHER with Mr. MEYER of Louisiana.
Mr. PUGH with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.
Mr. LANE with Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.
Mr. NEEDHAM with Mr. SNODGRASS.
Mr. ZENOR with Mr. FARIS.
Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH with Mr. SUTHERLAND.
Mr. COUSINS with Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi.
Mr. JENKINS with Mr. SMITH of Kentucky.
Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. TATE.

On this vote:

Mr. ADAMS with Mr. MCALEER.
Mr. SHOWALTER with Mr. NAPHEN.

For this day:

Mr. HEPBURN with Mr. DALY of New Jersey.
Mr. COCHRANE of New York with Mr. FOX.
Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee.
Mr. BULL with Mr. BERRY.

On this case:

Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. LEVY.
Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. CLAYTON of New York.
Mr. LOVERING with Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts.

For one week:

Mr. MILLER with Mr. RIDGELY.

For the session:

Mr. METCALF with Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky.
Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. FITZGERALD, voted. I want to call attention to the fact that he is paired with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. LOVERING.

Mr. ADAMS. I wish to ask whether my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. MCALEER, voted.

The SPEAKER. He did not vote.

Mr. ADAMS. Then I wish to be recorded as "present."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is not recorded, so he can not be marked "present" now.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, when the name of my colleague, Mr. ZENOR, was called some one answered. I wish to say that my colleague is paired with the gentleman from Indiana.

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded as having voted.

Because of the closeness of this vote the Chair will order a recapitulation; and he requests the House to observe order so that an accurate record may be obtained.

The vote was recapitulated.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be recorded in the negative.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the House during the call of the roll?

Mr. TOMPKINS. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman can not vote.

Because of the closeness of this vote and the importance of it to the parties interested, the Chair has asked the Clerk to carefully reexamine the footings before the announcement of the result is made. [A pause.] On this question the yeas are 128, the nays 128; answering "present," 11. So the proposed substitute is rejected. The question recurs on the adoption of the resolutions reported by the committee. If there is no objection, the Clerk will read them.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That William T. Crawford was not elected a Representative to the Fifty-sixth Congress from the Ninth district of North Carolina, and is not entitled to a seat therein; and

Resolved, That Richmond Pearson was elected a Representative to the Fifty-sixth Congress from the Ninth district of North Carolina, and is entitled to the seat.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to these resolutions.

Mr. ROBERTS. On that question I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 129, nays 127, answered "present" 12, not voting 84; as follows:

YEAS—129.

Acheson, Adams, Aldrich, Alexander, Allen, Me. Babcock, Bailey, Kans. Baker, Barham, Barney, Bingham, Bishop, Boutell, Ill. Bowersock, Brick, Brosius, Brown, Burke, S. Dak. Burkett, Burleigh, Burton,	Butler, Cannon, Capron, Clarke, N. H. Connell, Corliss, Cromer, Crump, Crumpacker, Curtis, Cushman, Dalzell, Davenport, S. A. Davidson, Dayton, Dick, Eddy, Emerson, Esch, Fordney, Foss,	Fowler, Freer, Gamble, Gardner, Mich. Gardner, N. J. Gill, Gillett, N. Y. Gillett, Mass. Graft, Graham, Greene, Mass. Grosvenor, Grout, Grow, Hamilton, Haugen, Hedge, Hemenway, Hill, Hitt, Hoffecker,	Howell, Hull, Jones, Wash. Joy, Kahn, Lawrence, Linney, Littauer, Littlefield, Long, Loud, Loudenslager, Lybrand, McCleary, McPherson, Mahon, Marsh, Mercer, Minor, Mondell, Moody, Mass.
---	---	---	---

Moody, Oreg.
Morris,
Mudd,
O'Grady,
Olmsted,
Otjen,
Overstreet,
Packer, Pa.
Parker, N. J.
Payne,
Pearce, Mo.
Pearre,

Powers,
Ray,
Reeder,
Roberts,
Russell,
Shattuc,
Shelden,
Smith, H. C.
Southard,
Sperry,
Sprague,
Steele,

Stewart, N. J.
Stewart, N. Y.
Stewart, Wis.
Sulloway,
Tawney,
Tayler, Ohio
Thropp,
Tompkins,
Tongue,
Van Voorhis,
Vreeland,
Wachter,

Wadsworth,
Wanger,
Waters,
Watson,
Weaver,
Weeks,
White,
Wise,
Young,

NAYS—127.

Adamson,
Allen, Ky.
Atwater,
Bailey, Tex.
Ball,
Bankhead,
Barber,
Bartlett,
Bell,
Bellamy,
Benton,
Bradley,
Brantley,
Breazeale,
Brenner,
Brewer,
Brundidge,
Burleson,
Burnett,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Chanler,
Clark, Mo.
Clayton, Ala.
Cooney,
Cowherd,
Cox,
Crowley,
Cummings,
Davenport, S. W.
Davey,
Davis,

De Armond,
De Graffenreid,
De Vries,
Denny,
Dinsmore,
Dougherty,
Driggs,
Elliot,
Finley,
Fitzgerald, N. Y.
Foster,
Gaston,
Gayle,
Gilbert,
Glynn,
Gordon,
Green, Pa.
Griggs,
Hay,
Henry, Miss.
Howard,
Jack,
Johnston,
Jones, Va.
King,
Kitchin,
Kleberg,
Kluttz,
Lamb,
Lanham,
Lassiter,
Latimer,

Lentz,
Lester,
Little,
Livingston,
Lloyd,
McAleer,
McClellan,
McCulloch,
McLain,
McRae,
Maddox,
May,
Meekison,
Miers, Ind.
Moon,
Muller,
Neville,
Norton, Ohio
Norton, S. C.
Otey,
Polk,
Quarles,
Ransdell,
Rhea, Ky.
Rhea, Va.
Richardson,
Riordan,
Rixey,
Robinson, Ind.
Robinson, Nebr.
Rucker,
Ruppert,

Ryan, N. Y.
Ryan, Pa.
Salmon,
Scudder,
Shackleford,
Sheppard,
Sibley,
Slayden,
Small,
Sparkman,
Spight,
Stallings,
Stark,
Stephens, Tex.
Stokes,
Sulzer,
Swanson,
Talbert,
Terry,
Thayer,
Thomas, N. C.
Turner,
Underhill,
Underwood,
Vandiver,
Williams, J. R.
Williams, W. E.
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Idaho
Wilson, N. Y.
Ziegler.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—12.

Bromwell,
Brownlow,
Bull,

Fitzgerald, Mass.
Gibson,
Griffith,

Jenkins,
Jett,
Needham,

Pugh,
Wheeler, Ky.
Wright.

NOT VOTING—84.

Allen, Miss.
Bartholdt,
Berry,
Boreing,
Boutelle, Me.
Broussard,
Burke, Tex.
Calderhead,
Carmack,
Catchings,
Clayton, N. Y.
Cochran, Mo.
Cochrane, N. Y.
Cooper, Tex.
Cooper, Wis.
Cousins,
Crawford,
Cusack,
Dahle, Wis.
Daly, N. J.
Dolliver,

Dovener,
Driscoll,
Faris,
Fitzpatrick,
Fleming,
Fletcher,
Fox,
Gaines,
Hall,
Hawley,
Heatwole,
Henry, Conn.
Henry, Tex.
Hepburn,
Hopkins,
Kerr,
Ketcham,
Knox,
Lacey,
Lands,
Lane,

Levy,
Lewis,
Lorimer,
Lovering,
McCall,
McDowell,
Mann,
Mesick,
Metcalf,
Meyer, La.
Miller,
Morgan,
Naphen,
Newlands,
Noonan,
Pierce, Tenn.
Phillips,
Prince,
Reeves,
Ridgely,
Robb,

Robertson, La.
Rosenberg,
Shafroth,
Sherman,
Showalter,
Sims,
Smith, Ill.
Smith, Ky.
Smith, Samuel W.
Smith, Wm. Alden
Snodgrass,
Spalding,
Stevens, Minn.
Sutherland,
Tate,
Taylor, Ala.
Thomas, Iowa
Warner,
Weymouth,
Wilson, S. C.
Zenor.

So the resolutions reported by the committee were adopted.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I rise to correct an evident misunderstanding regarding a pair which was arranged between the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. LOVERING, and myself. On the night before last, when I learned that this election case was coming up for consideration, I telegraphed from Boston and asked the gentleman from Massachusetts to pair with me on what I supposed was the question of consideration. He replied that on account of his friendly relations with Mr. Pearson he did not desire to do that, but would endeavor to arrange a pair for me. Yesterday morning he telegraphed me that he could not arrange a pair for me, but had paired with me himself. I supposed that that pair applied only to the question of consideration; and seeing my colleague around here this morning I supposed the pair was off. Hence, when my name was called, I voted. A short time afterwards, on going to the door of the Hall, where I was called, I received a message from Mr. LOVERING's secretary who asked me if I would arrange a pair with Mr. LOVERING, who was unavoidably detained in the settling up of an important lawsuit. I told him that I could arrange a pair with Mr. DALY of New Jersey, and asked him if that was all right, to which he replied "Yes."

Now, gentlemen on the other side of the House seem to think that my pair with Mr. LOVERING ought to remain, and on inquiry at the desk where pairs are arranged, the gentleman there states that Mr. LOVERING went away with the understanding that I was paired; so that in order to carry out what seems to be Mr. LOVERING's understanding of the matter, I withdraw my vote. I will not do anything which can be construed in any manner to look like unfair dealing.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts, and he answered "present."

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I withdraw on both votes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The other vote has been announced, the Chair will state to the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that my vote may be withdrawn on the first vote as well as this.

The SPEAKER. That can not be done now.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I ask for a recapitulation of the vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks for a recapitulation; and as the Chair always believes in eliminating every possibility of error he will exercise his functions and order a recapitulation. All gentlemen will please keep silence while the Clerk recapitulates the votes.

The Clerk recapitulated the names of those voting.

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks the attention of the House. It has been discovered that on the first vote the yeas were 127 and nays 128. It only strengthens the failure of the minority resolution at that time, but the Chair thinks it to be his duty to advise the House at once of that fact.

Mr. RICHARDSON. How did that mistake occur, Mr. Speaker, may I ask?

The SPEAKER. In carrying the footings forward. It was discovered by the stenographers in comparing the tally sheet.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It was not by the extra vote of any member.

The SPEAKER. Oh, no; it was an error at the desk in transferring the footings.

On this question the yeas are 129 and nays are 127; present 12. The yeas have it, and the resolutions are adopted. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ROBERTS. I ask that Richmond Pearson be called to the bar of the House and sworn in as a member.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will step forward.

Mr. Pearson appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

And then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of progress of survey of Big Stone Lake and Lake Traverse, Minnesota and South Dakota—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting a list of judgments for claims in Indian depredation cases not heretofore appropriated for—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of deficiencies in appropriation for Indian Service—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BARHAM, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9677) for preventing the adulteration, misbranding, and imitation of foods, beverages, candies, drugs, and condiments in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and for regulating interstate traffic therein, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1426); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JENKINS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3490) in relation to admissions to and dismissions from the Reform School of the District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1427); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BABCOCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 124) regulating permits for private conduits in the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report

(No. 1428); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4048) to amend an act regulating the inspection of flour in the District of Columbia, approved December 21, 1898, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1429); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9827) to close all alleys in block 3 of the Walbridge subdivisions of Ingleside, in the county of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1430); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRIGGS, from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10308) to give certain publications the privileges of second-class mail matter as to admission to the mails, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1431); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JENKINS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11326) to regulate the collection of taxes in the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1432); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 66) for the relief of the heirs of Margaret Kennedy, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1424); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9156) granting a pension to James Conant—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9020) to pension William J. Smith, late Company B, Sixteenth United States Infantry—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 11463) to amend section 5198 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11464) to amend section 5197, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 11465) to encourage the holding of an interstate and West Indian exposition in the city of Charleston, in the State of South Carolina, in the year 1901—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 11466) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for those who volunteered and enlisted for the war with Spain and served beyond the term of their enlistment to help suppress the Philippine insurrection—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS (by request): A bill (H. R. 11475) to authorize the Jefferson Telephone Company to construct and maintain lines and offices for general telephone business in the Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, Seminole, and Chickasaw nations, in the Indian Territory, and also in the Osage Reservation, in the Territory of Oklahoma—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11486) granting pension to soldiers and sailors of war of 1861 to 1865 who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 252) authorizing foreign exhibitors at the Ohio Centennial and Northwest Territory Exposition, to be held in Toledo, Ohio, in 1902, to bring to this country foreign laborers from their respective countries for the purpose of preparing for and making their exhibits, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 11467) granting an increase of pension to William D. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 11468) granting a pension to Clara V. Pyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 11469) granting a pension to William Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 11470) for the relief of Caleb H. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11471) for the relief of George C. Booth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11472) granting an increase of pension to John A. Wilsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11473) for the relief of Michael Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11474) for the relief of Jacob Cook—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 11476) for the relief of L. A. Davis—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DE VRIES: A bill (H. R. 11477) to increase the pension of Heinrich Ernest Brockelman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 11478) for the relief of Charles Springer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11479) for the relief of Henry B. Kretzler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 11480) for the relief of Mrs. Martha A. Royce—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 11481) for the relief of the legal representatives of Paul Curtis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 11482) granting an increase of pension to Mary Emily Wilcox—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCRAE: A bill (H. R. 11483) granting a pension to David White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. QUARLES: A bill (H. R. 11484) for the relief of D. D. Price—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 11485) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hanley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 11487) removing the charge of desertion against Marmaduke R. Goodwin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11488) to grant a pension to Isabella Armiger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11489) for the relief of the representatives of the late Henry Barnes, for the property taken in 1862 for the use of the Army of the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 11490) for the relief of Mary Fass—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11491) for the relief of William A. Forbes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11492) for the relief of George Senell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11493) to increase pension of Sampson Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11494) to correct military record of Nelson J. Partlow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS: A resolution (H. Res. 255) to continue the messenger in charge of the heavy mail wagon from the 1st day of July, 1900, to December 3, 1900—to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petition of Scates & Co. and other druggists of Fort Fairfield, Me., for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Petition of retail druggists of Ottawa, Kans., for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Electrical Workers' Brotherhood of Columbus, Ohio, against the passage of the Grout bill taxing butterine, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Octoraro, Pa.; the Church of God and other organizations and citizens of Lancaster, Pa., to prohibit the selling of liquors in any post exchange, transport, or premises used for military purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Sampson Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Nelson J. Partlow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 9840, granting a pension to William Snider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Grand Army of the Republic posts and numerous citizens of the State of Illinois, to grant pensions to soldiers and sailors who served ninety days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: Petitions of C. E. Joslin and R. B. Kelly, druggists, of Topeka, Kans., for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Douglas and Atlanta, Kans., protesting against the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of Corning Post, No. 259, Department of Kansas, asking for the setting aside of Beecher Island for a national park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Carpenters' Union of Topeka, Kans., in favor of having some of the work on new ships done at the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DAHLE of Wisconsin: Protest of Hubert Springer and 175 other citizens of Waterloo, Wis., against the passage of House bill No. 5791, relating to the collection of judgments against municipal corporations—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Conrad Engsborg, of Lake Mills, Wis., for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GASTON: Petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Baptist Church, and Patrons of Husbandry Grange, of Townville, and Methodist Episcopal Church of Union City, Pa., urging the passage of House bill prohibiting the sale of liquor in Army canteens, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of John Fisher Post, No. 337, of Riceville, Pa., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of North Shenango Central Grange, of Crawford County, Pa., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of J. P. Urben, of Allegheny, Pa., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Electrical Brotherhood of Columbus, Ohio, against any legislation regulating the manufacture of butterine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the passage of House bill No. 10374, amending the postal law relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York City, for improved postal service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Resolution of Gerber Post, No. 562, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of K. T. Cummings and other retail druggists of Hartford, Conn., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of H. P. Bissell and other druggists of Ridgefield, Conn., for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of druggists of Perth Amboy, Asbury Park, and Ocean Grove, N. J., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACK: Petition of W. H. Johnston and others, of Westmoreland County, Pa., favoring the passage of the Grout bill to amend the oleomargarine law of 1896—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KERR: Petition of druggists and citizens of Bellville, Ohio, for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Petition of William N. McConnell, of Fulton County, Ga., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of Hiram S. Adams, deceased, of Fulton County, Ga., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petition of citizens of the First Congressional district of Missouri, asking that the Missouri State Militia be pensioned—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Post 166, of La Grange, and Post No. 25, of

Glenwood, Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7091, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Paul Curtis, of Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAHON: Petitions of the Women's Christian Temperance unions of Lewisburg and Reedsville, Pa.; First Baptist Church of Huntingdon, Pa.; Epworth League of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Luther League of the Lutheran Church, and the Christian Endeavor Society of the Presbyterian Church, of Reedsville, Pa., for the passage of the Bowersock anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKISON: Petition of West Hope Grange, No. 215, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ohio, in favor of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of West Hope Grange, No. 215, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ohio, in relation to anti-trust laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of West Hope Grange, No. 215, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ohio, in relation to adulterated food products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of West Hope Grange, No. 215, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring legislation for the election of United States Senators by popular vote—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. RHEA of Kentucky (by request): Papers to accompany House bill for the relief Simeon B. Leech, of Todd County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of E. S. Hough and other druggists of Manchester, Tenn., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Petition of Joseph W. Colcord, of Lynn, Mass., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCUDDER: Petition of Lewis O. Conklyn Post, No. 627, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petition of Eldred Grange, No. 467, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pennsylvania, in favor of Senate bill No. 1439, relating to an act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petition of Frenchtown Grange, No. 749, Monroe County, Mich., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: Petition of Dr. M. A. Mackintosh, of Paterson, N. J., relating to the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THAYER: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and Rev. Arthur Bonner, of Medford, Mass., in favor of the Bowersock anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petition of Richard Berry and other druggists of Newbern, N. C., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WACHTER: Papers to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Marmaduke R. Goodwin, late of Company F, Seventeenth New York Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: Petition of W. H. Baugh, of Shoshone, Idaho, for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, May 11, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

STATISTICS RELATIVE TO PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 25th instant, a report showing, by States, the number, location, character, and cost of each completed public building under the control of the Treasury Department, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.